



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 48]

No. 48]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, नवम्बर 29, 1986/अग्राहायण 8, 1908

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1986/AGRAHAYANA 8, 1908

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Page is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए सार्वजनिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than
the Ministry of Defence)

विधि और न्याय मंत्रालय
(विधि कार्य विभाग)

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 31 अक्टूबर, 1986

का.प्र. 3955 —नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के
नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह
सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री प्रेम पाल एस. अहूजा, एडवो-
केट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के
अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे दिल्ली
व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया
जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति को नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर
किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के
चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में भेजे जाये।

[सं. एक 5 (74)/86—न्या.]

आर. एन. पौडार, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
(Department of Legal Affairs)
NOTICE

New Delhi, the 31st October, 1986

S.O. 3955.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent
Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules,

1956, that application has been made to the said Authority,
under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sri Prem Paul S. Ahuja
Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person
as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the under-
signed within fourteen days of the publication of this
Notice.

[No. F. 5(74)/86-Judl.

R. N. PODDAR, Competent Authority

गृह मंत्रालय

(भारतीय सुरक्षा विभाग)

(पुनर्वास प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 अक्टूबर, 1986

का.प्र. 3956:—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास)
अधिनियम 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के
परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार सहायक
पंजीकार, भूमि दावा संगठन, चण्डीगढ़ हरियाणा सरकार, चण्डीगढ़ को
अपने कार्य के अतिरिक्त, हरियाणा राज्य में प्रतिकर मूल की भूमि तथा
संपत्तियों के लिए, उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत प्रबन्ध अधिकारी को सौंपे
गए कार्य करने के लिए प्रबन्ध अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 1 (8)/विशेष सेल/86-एस.एस.-II (ख)]

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

(Department of Internal Security)

(Rehabilitation Division)

New Delhi, the 21st October, 1986

S.O. 3956.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (C&R) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Assistant Registrar, Land Claims Organisation, Chandigarh Government of Haryana, Chandigarh as Managing Officer in addition to his own duties for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to a Managing Officer by or under said Act, in respect of the lands and properties forming part of the Compensation Pool within the State of Haryana.

[No. 1(8) Spl. Cell/86 SS.II(B)]

का.आ. 3957—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 2 की उपधारा (1) के परमपत्र द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार हरियाणा राज्य के सभी तहसीलदार (बिक्री) नायब तहसीलदार, (बिक्री) तथा नायब तहसीलदार (पुनर्वास) को उनके अपने कार्य के अतिरिक्त हरियाणा राज्य में प्रतिकर मूल की भूमि तथा संपत्तियों के लिए, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत प्रबन्ध अधिकारियों को सौदे गए कार्य करने के लिए प्रबन्ध अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या-1 (8)/विशेष सैव/86-एम एन. II(क)]

मुहम्मद अमलम, उप सचिव

S.O. 3957.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (C&R) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954) the Central Government hereby appoints all the Tehsildars (Sales), Naib Tehsildars (Sales) and Naib Tehsildars (Reh.) in the State of Haryana as Managing Officers in addition to their own duties for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to Managing Officers by or under the said Act, in respect of the lands and properties forming part of the Compensation Pool within the State of Haryana.

[No. 1(8)/Spl. Cell/86-SS.II(A)]

M. ASLAM, Dy. Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 अगस्त, 1986

आयकर

का.आ. 3958:—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खंड (44) के उपखंड (iii) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी श्री के.पी. कोसाम्बिया को कर बसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हेतु प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री के.पी. कोसाम्बिया द्वारा कर बसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं. 6879/फा.सं. 398/36/85-आ.क. (ब)]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 22nd August, 1986

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3958.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and Central Government hereby authorises Shri K. P. Kosambia being Gazetted Officer of the Central Government to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri K. P. Kosambia takes over charge as Recovery Officer.

[No. 6879/F. No. 398/36/85-IT(B)]

का.आ. 3959:—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खंड (44) के उपखंड (3) के अनुसरण में नौवें स्तम्भ 2 में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत नौवें स्तम्भ 3 के सामने उल्लिखित अवधियों के लिए कर बसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा कार्योत्तर रूप से प्राधिकृत करती है।

क. उन व्यक्तियों के नाम, यह तारीख जिससे, व्यक्तियों में, जिन्होंने कर बसूली को कर बसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत किया गया।

1	2	3
1. श्री एम. सी. काम्बले	24-6-82 से 17-9-1984 तक	
2. श्रीमती बी. आर. चन्द्रा	03-6-82 से 11-5-1984 तक	
3. श्री जे. आर. दाहद	17-6-82 से 20-6-1984 तक	
4. श्री बी. के. पी. मेनन	19-6-82 से 02-9-1984 तक	
5. श्रीमती एस. एम. हिगोराणी	14-6-82 से 10-8-1984 तक	
6. श्री एम. बी. भाम्बरे	14-6-82 से 06-9-1984 तक	
7. श्री आर. एम. शेख	07-6-82 से 05-9-1984 तक	
8. श्री बी. सी. मैथ्यू	10-6-82 से 06-9-1984 तक	
9. श्री सां. के. बी. नायर	06-6-82 से 27-6-1984 तक	
10. श्री डी. एन. सिंह	25-7-83 से 21-6-1984 तक	
11. श्री एस. आर. शामदा साना	16-6-83 से 22-8-1985 तक	

[सं. 6881/फा.सं. 398/36/85-आ.क. (ब)]

S.O. 3959.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), Ex-post-facto authorisation of the Central Government is hereby conveyed to the persons mentioned below in column 2, being a Gazetted Officer of Central Government, to the exercise of the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer

under the said Act for the periods mentioned against each below in Column 3.

Sl. No.	Name of the Persons who exercised the powers of T.R.O.'s	Date from which persons authorised to exercise the power of T.R.O.'s
1	2	3
1.	Shri M.C. Kamble	from 24-6-82 to 17-9-1984.
2.	Smt. V.R. Chandra	from 03-6-82 to 11-5-1984.
3.	Shri J.R. Dahad	from 17-6-82 to 20-6-1984.
4.	Shri. V.K.P. Menon	from 19-6-82 to 02-9-1984
5.	Smt. S.M. Hingorani	from 14-6-82 to 10-8-1984
6.	Shri M.B. Bhambre	from 14-6-82 to 06-9-1984
7.	Shri R.M. Sheikh	from 07-6-82 to 05-9-1984
8.	Shri V.C. Mathew	from 10-6-82 to 06-9-1984
9.	Shri C.V.K. Nair	from 06-6-82 to 27-6-1984
10.	Shri D.N. Singh	from 25-7-83 to 21-6-1984
11.	Shri S.R. Shamdasani	from 16-6-83 to 22-8-1985

[No. 6881/F. No. 398/36/85-IT(B)]

का.आ. 3960 :—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (3) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा नीचे स्तम्भ 4 में उल्लिखित अधिसूचना (अधिसूचनाओं) का अधिलेखन करते हुए नीचे स्तम्भ 3 में उल्लिखित कर वसूली अधिकारियों के स्थान पर नीचे स्तम्भ 2 में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को, जो कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारियों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करता है :—

क्रम उन व्यक्तियों के नाम जिन्हें कर वसूली (अधिकारियों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हेतु प्राधिकृत किया जाना है।

उन कर वसूली अधिकारी (अधिकारियों) के नाम जिनके स्थान पर स्तम्भ 2 में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को प्राधिकृत किया जाना है।

पुरानी अधिसूचना सं. तथा तारीख जिन का अधिलेखन किया जाता है।

1	2	3	4
1.	श्री बी. बी. अभिचन्दानी	श्री एच. एम. अम्बे	5824 दि. 21-5-84 [फा. सं. 398/27/83-आ.क. (ब)]
2.	श्री वाई. ए. सोनावणे	श्री बी. बी. काले	6131 दि. 04-2-85 [फा. सं. 398/36/84-आ.क. (ब)]
3.	श्री पी. वा. राणे	श्री नूर अहमद	—तदैव—
4.	श्री जे. पी. अभिचन्दानी	श्री जी. बी. घाटोकार	5826 दि. 21-5-84 [फा. सं. 398/27/83-आ.क. (ब)]

2. यह अधिसूचना तत्काल लागू होगी तथा जहाँ तक स्तम्भ 2 में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों का सम्बन्ध है कर वसूली अधिकारियों के रूप में उनके कार्यभार सम्भालने की तारीख (तारीखों) से लागू होगी।

[सं. 6877 फा.सं. 398/36/85-आ.क. (ब)]

S. O. 3960—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises the persons mentioned below column 2, being the Gazetted Officers, of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officer(s) under the said Act in place of the Tax Recovery Officers mentioned below in column 3 of in supersession of the Notification(s) mentioned below in column 4 :

Sl. No.	Name of the persons to be authorised to exercise powers of Tax Recovery Officer(s)	Name of Tax Recovery Officer(s) in place of whom the persons mentioned in column 2 are to be authorised	Old Notification No. and date to be superseded
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri V.B. Abhichandani	Shri H.S. Ambe	5824 Dt 21-5-84 [F No 398/27/83-IT]
2.	Shri Y.A. Sonawane	Sh. V.B. Kále	61-31 Dt : 04-2-85. [F.No. 398/36/84-I T (B)]
3.	Shri P.B. Rane	Sh. Noor Ahmed	-do-
4.	Shr. J.P. Abhichandani	Sh. G.V. Ghatikar	5826 dt 21-5-84 (F No 398/27/83-II (B))

2. This Notification shall come into force with immediate effect and in so far as persons mentioned in column 2 from the date(s) they take over charge(s) as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 6877/F.No. 398/36/85-IT(B).]

नई दिल्ली, 10 सितम्बर, 1986

का. आ. 3961 :—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खंड (44) के उपखंड (iii) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा, नीचे स्तम्भ 4 में उल्लिखित अधिसूचना का अधिलेखन करते हुए नीचे स्तम्भ 3 में उल्लिखित कर वसूली अधिकारियों के स्थान पर स्तम्भ 2 में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली

अधिकारियों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती हैं :—

क्रम	उन व्यक्तियों के नाम जिन्हें कर वसूलों अधिकारियों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हेतु प्राधिकृत किया जाना है।	उन कर वसूलों के नाम जिनके स्थान पर स्तंभ 2 में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को प्राधिकृत किया जाना है।	उन पुराने अधिसूचनाओं की सं. और तारीख जिनका अधिलेखन किया जाना है।
------	---	---	--

1	2	3	4
1. श्री एन. कृष्णामूर्ति	श्री ए. आर. नगराज	5199 Dt. 24-5-83. [फा. सं. 398/2/83-आ. क. (ब)]	दिनांक
2. श्री आर. श्रीनिवासचर	श्री एस. बी. अश्वथनारायण	4884 Dt. 27-8-82 [फा. सं. 398/27/82-आ. क. (ब)]	दिनांक
3. श्री के. वा. नरहरि	श्री जी. मुनि-बैकटप्पा	5090 Dt. 16-2-83 [फा. सं. 398/2/83-आ. क. (ब)]	दिनांक

2. यह अधिसूचना तत्काल लागू होगी तथा जहाँ तक स्तम्भ 2 में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों का संबंध है, कर वसूलों अधिकारियों के रूप में उनके कार्यभार संभालने की तारीख (तारीखों) से लागू होगी।

[सं. 6901/फा.सं. 398/19/86-आ.क. (ब)]

New Delhi, the 10th September, 1986

S.O. 3961 :—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises the persons mentioned below Column 2, being the Gazetted Officers of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officers under the said Act in place of the Tax Recovery Officers mentioned below in column 3 in supersession of the Notifications mentioned below in column 4.

S. No.	Name of the persons to be authorised to exercise powers of Tax Recovery officers	Name of Tax Recovery officers in place of whom the persons mentioned in column 2 are to be authorised	Old Notification No. and date to be superseded
1.	2	3	4
1.	Shri N. Krishnamurthy	Sh. A.R. Nagaraja	5199 Dt. 24-5-83. (F.No. 398/2/83-IT(B))

1	2	3	4
2.	Sh. C.R. Srinivasachar	Shri S.B. Aswatha narayana.	4884 Dt. 27-8-82. (F.No. 398/27/82-IT (B))

3.	Sh. K.V. Narahari.	Shri G. Muniven- katappa	5090 Dt. 16-2-83. [F.No. 398/2/83-IT(B)]
----	--------------------	--------------------------	--

2. This Notification shall come into force with immediate effect and in so far as mentioned in column 2 from the dates they take over charges as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 6901/F.No. 393/19/86-IT(B)]

का. आ. 3962 :—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खंड 44 के उपखंड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार राजस्व विभाग का दिनांक 7-2-1984 का अधिसूचना सं. 5612 [फा.सं. 398/12/83 आ.क. (ब)] का अधिलेखन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजस्व अधिकारों श्री एम्.एल. अग्रवाल को कर वसूली अधिकारों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हेतु प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री एम्.एल. अग्रवाल द्वारा कर वसूलों अधिकारों के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं. 6903/फा.सं. 398/20/86-आ.क. (ब)]

बी. ई. अलेक्जेंडर, अवसर सचिव

S.O. 3962.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 5612 (F. No. 398/12/83-IT(B)) dated the 7-2-1984, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri M. L. Agarwal, being a Gazetted Officer of the Central Government to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri M. L. Agarwal takes over charges as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 6903/F. No. 398/20/86-IT(B)]

B. E. ALEXANDER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 14 नवम्बर, 1986

आदेश

स्टाम्प

का. आ. 3963—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 को उपधारा (1) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उस शुल्क को माफ करती है जो आवात तथा शहरी विकास निगम लिमिटेड नई दिल्ली, द्वारा आवृण-पत्रों के रूप में जारी किए जाने वाले उत्तरेस करों अस्सी लाख रु. के मूल्य के

“11 प्रतिशत ऋणपत्र 2001 XXVI श्रृंखला” के उल्लिखित बंधपत्रों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत प्रभाय है।

[सं. 44/86-स्टाम्प-फ. सं. 33/63/86-बि. क.]

New Delhi, the 14th November, 1986

ORDER
STAMPS

S.O. 3963.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the bonds in the nature of Debentures described as “11 per cent Debentures—2001 XXVI series” to the value of nineteen crores and eighty lakhs rupees to be issued by Housing and Urban Development Corporation Limited New Delhi are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 44/86-Stamp-F. No. 33/63/86-ST]

आदेश
स्टाम्प

का. आ. 9634.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा रेमंड वुलन मिल्स, लिमिटेड, बंबई को मात्र तीन लाख सैंतीस हजार और पचास सौ रु. के उस समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क की अदायगी करने की अनुमति देता है जो उक्त कंपनी द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले मास चार करोड़ पचास लाख रु. के मूल्य के क्रम संख्या 1 से 4, 50, 000 तक के 15% असम्परिवर्तनीय ऋणपत्रों पर, जिनका प्रत्येक का अंकित मूल्य 100/- रु. है, स्टाम्प के कारण प्रभाय है।

[सं. 45/86-स्टाम्प-फ. सं. 33/62/86-बि. क.]

ORDER
STAMPS

S.O. 3964.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Raymand Woollen Mills, Limited, Bombay to pay consolidated stamp duty of Three lakhs, thirty seven thousand and five hundred rupees only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on 15 per cent Non-convertible Debentures of the face value of Rs. 100 each bearing Serial Nos. 1 to 4,50,000 of the face value of Four crores and fifty lakhs rupees to be issued by the said Company.

[No. 45/86-Stamp-F. No. 33/62/86-ST]

आदेश
स्टाम्प

का. आ. 3965.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एशियन केबल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड बम्बई को केवल अठारह सौ हजार तीन सौ एक रु. पच्चीस पैसे के उस समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क की अदायगी करने की अनुमति प्रदान करती है, जो उक्त कारपोरेशन द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले सैंतीस लाख, तिहतर हजार और तीन सौ रु. के अंकित मूल्य के प्रत्येक 100 रु. के क्रम संख्या 1 से 37,

733 तक 15% बन्धक असम्परिवर्तनीय ऋणपत्रों पर स्टाम्प शुल्क के कारण प्रभाय है।

[संख्या 43/86-स्टाम्प-फ. सं. 33/22/86-बि. क.]

बा. आर. महमो, अवर सचिव

ORDER
STAMPS

S.O. 3965.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Asian Cables Corporation Limited, Bombay to pay consolidated stamp duty of rupees twenty eight thousand, three hundred and one and twenty five paise only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on 15 per cent mortgage non-convertible debentures of Rs 100 each bearing serial Nos. 1 to 37,733 of the face value of rupees thirty seven lakhs, seventy three thousand and three hundred to be issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 43/86-Stamp-F. No. 33/22/86-ST]

B. R. MEHMI, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)
(वैकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 अक्टूबर, 1986,

का. आ. 3966.—राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक, अधिनियम, 1981 (1981 का 61) की धारा 19 के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक द्वारा 11, 12 और 13 नवम्बर, 1986 की अवधि के दौरान 100 रुपये प्रतिशत मूल्य पर, 15 वर्ष की परिपक्वता अवधि वाले जारी किये जाने वाले 50 करोड़ रुपये (पचास करोड़ रुपये केवल) के बांडों पर देय ब्याज की दर 11 प्रतिशत (ग्यारह प्रतिशत) तय करती है। राष्ट्रीय कृषि और ग्रामीण विकास बैंक को उक्त अधिवृचित राशि से 10 प्रतिशत से अधिक तक प्रभिदान की राशि अपने पास रख लेने का अधिकार होगा।

[संख्या 10(102)/86-ए.सी.]

के.पी. पान्डियान, अवर सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)
(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 16th October, 1986

S.O. 3966.—In pursuance of clause (a) of Section 19 of the National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development Act, 1981 (61 of 1981), the Central Government hereby fixes 11.00 per cent (eleven per cent) per annum as the rate of interest payable on the bonds of Rs. 50 crores (Rupees fifty crores only) to be issued at 100.00 per cent during the period from 11th, 12th & 13th November, 1986 with right to retain subscriptions received upto 10 per cent in excess of the notified amount with a maturity period of 15 years by the National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development.

[No. 10(102)/86-AC]

K. P. PANDIAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 नवम्बर, 1986

का. आ. 3967.—बैंकारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 की उपधारा (2) के उपबन्ध 30

मई, 1987 तक की अवधि के लिये यूनाइटेड बैंक आफ इंडिया, कलकत्ता पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक कि इनका सम्बन्ध प्लेजों के रूप में मैसर्स भारत स्टील मैटल इंडस्ट्रीज, लि. में इसके शेयरों की धारिता से है।

[संख्या 15/19/82-बी.ओ.-III]

एम.एस. सीतारामन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th November, 1986

S.O. 3967.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 19 of the said Act shall not apply to the United Bank of India, Calcutta for a further period till 30th May 1987 in so far as they relate to its holding of shares of M/s. Bharat Sheet Metal Industries Ltd., as pledgee.

[No. 15/19/82-B.O.III]

M. S. SEETHARAMAN, Under Secy.

समाहृतिय केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

नागपुर, 13 नवम्बर, 1986

अधिसूचना सं. 17/86

(दिनांक 8/11/86)

का. अ. 3968 :—श्री के. वा. य. पांडे, अधीक्षक, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, समूह 'ख' निवर्तन का आयु प्राप्त होने पर शासकीय सेवा से दिनांक 30-9-86 को अपराह्न में सेवानिवृत्त हुए।

[सी. सं. 2 (3)/1/86 स्था. I/88303]

रमेश कुमार आदिम, उप समाहर्ता (कार्मिक और स्थापना)

CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE

Nagpur, the 13th November, 1986

NOTIFICATION NO. 17/86

(Dated : 8-11-86)

S.O. 3968.—Shri K. Y. Pande, Superintendent, Central Excise Group 'B' having attained the age of superannuation retired from Government Service on 30-9-86 (A.N.).

[C. No. II(3)1/86/Et. I/88303]

R. K. AUDIM, Dy. Collector (P&E)

उद्योग मंत्रालय

(कम्पनी कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1986

का. अ. 3969 :—कम्पनी अधिनियम 1956 (1956 का 1) की धारा 10-ई की उप-धारा (2) तथा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा कम्पनी कार्य विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. ए-45011/45/83-प्रशा. -1, दिनांक 4 फरवरी, 1986 द्वारा संशोधित अधिसूचना का. अ. सं. 2828, दिनांक 30 मई, 1985 का अधिक्रमण

करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा कम्पनी विधि बोर्ड का 1 अगस्त, 1986 के पूर्वाह्न में नीचे दिय अनुसार पुनर्गठन करती है।

(क) निम्नलिखित व्यक्ति कम्पनी विधि बोर्ड के सदस्य होंगे, अर्थात् :—

1. श्री वी. के. दर
2. श्री अशोक चन्द्र
3. श्री आर. एन. बंसल
4. श्री एस. कुमार
5. श्री वी. के. मजोत्रा
6. श्री सी. आर. सुन्दरराजन
7. श्री एल. डी. वेंकटरामन

(ख) श्री वी. के. दर कम्पनी विधि बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष होंगे।

[फाइल सं. ए-45011/45/83-प्रशा. -I (खंड-II)]

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

(Department of Company Affairs)

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1986

S.O. 3969.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (2) and (3) of Section 10-E of the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956), and in supersession of Department of Company Affairs' Notification S.O. No. 2828 dated 30th May, 1985 as amended by Notification No. A-45011/45/83-Admn. I dated 4th February, 1985, the Central Government hereby reconstitutes the Company Law Board as indicated hereunder with effect from the forenoon of 1st August, 1986.

(a) The following persons shall be the Members of the Company Law Board, namely :—

1. Shri V. K. Dar
2. Shri Ashok Chandra
3. Shri R. N. Bansal
4. Shri S. Kumar
5. Shri V. K. Majotra
6. Shri C. R. Sundararajan
7. Shri L. D. Venkataraman

(b) Shri V. K. Dar shall be the Chairman of the Company Law Board.

[F. No. A-45011/45/83-Admn. I (Vol. II)]

नई दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 1986

का. अ. 3970 :—एकाधिकार तथा अवरोधक व्यापारिक व्यवहार अधिनियम, 1969 (1969 का 54) की धारा 26 की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा मैसर्स एस्कोर्ट्स इम्प्लाईज एन्सीलीज लिमिटेड जिसका पंजीकृत कार्यालय 20/4, मथुरा रोड, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा) में है, के उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत पंजीकरण (पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र सं. 2135/86) के निरोस्तीकरण को अधिसूचित करती है।

—[सं. 16/12/86 - एम. -3]

एन. सी. गोयल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th November, 1986

S.O. 3970.—In pursuance of Sub-section (3) of Section 26 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby notifies the cancellation of the registration of M/s. Escorts Employees Ancillaries Limited having its registered office at 20/4, Mathura Road, Faridabad (Haryana) under the said Act (Certificate of Registration No. 2135/84).

[No. 16/12/86-M.III]

L. C. GOYAL, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1986

का.भा. 3971.—भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की दिनांक 15 सितम्बर, 1983 की अधिसूचना संख्या 3689 में आने और आर्थिक संशोधन करते हुए तेल उद्योग (विकास) अधिनियम 1974 (1974 का 47) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) के खण्ड (ख) तथा उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा तत्काल प्रभावी तारीख से अधिकतम दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए तेल उद्योग विकास बोर्ड में निम्नलिखित नियुक्तियाँ करती है, अर्थात् :—

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. श्री ब्रह्म दत्त | अध्यक्ष |
| पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्री | (श्री नारायण दत्त तिवारी के स्थान पर) |

2. श्री कमलेश शर्मा,
संयुक्त सचिव,
आर्थिक कार्य विभाग
वित्त मंत्रालय

सदस्य
(श्री के. माडिय के स्थान पर
केन्द्रीय सरकार के वित्तीय
मामलों से संबंधित मंत्रालय का
प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए
नियुक्त)

[फा. सं. 7/9/85-वित्त-2]

एम. कुमारस्वामी, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM & NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1986

S.O. 3971.—In partial and further modification of the Government of India in the erstwhile Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) notification No. 3689 dated the 15th September, 1983, and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) and clause (b) of sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Oil Industry (Development) Act, 1974 (47 of 1974), the Central Government hereby makes, with immediate effect and for a period not exceeding two years, the following appointments in the Oil Industry Development Board, namely :—

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Shri Brahm Dutt. | Chairman |
| Minister of Petroleum & Natural Gas. | (Vice Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari) |
| 2. Shri Kamlesh Sharma | Member |
| Joint Secretary, | (appointed to represent |
| Department of Economic | the Ministry of the |
| Affairs Ministry of Finance. | Central Government |
| | dealing with Finance |
| | Vice Shri K. Sandilya. |

[F. No. 7/9/85—Fin. II]

M. KUMARSAWAMI, Director

काष्ठ और नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

(नागरिक पूर्ति विभाग)

भारतीय मानक संस्था

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1986

का. भा. 3972.—तात्कालिक नागरिक पूर्ति तथा सहकारिता मंत्रालय (भारतीय मानक संस्था) की अधिसूचना सं. एस. ओ. 1360, दिनांक 1978-04-24 जो भारत के राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में दिनांक 1978-05-13 को प्रकाशित हुई थी, का आर्थिक संशोधन करते हुए भारतीय मानक संस्था एतद् द्वारा अधिसूचित करती है कि क्रम के मानक बिन्हु के डिजाइन में संशोधन कर दिया गया है। मानक बिन्हु (नों) के संशोधित डिजाइन, आर्थिक विवरण तथा तत्संबंधी भारतीय मानक के जोरोंक सहित (नांके) अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं।

यह मानक बिन्हु भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन बिन्हु) अधिनियम, 1952 और उसके प्राचीन बने नियमों तथा विनियमों के निमित्त 1985-01-01 से लागू होंगे।



अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	मानक बिन्हु का डिजाइन	उत्पाद/उत्पाद की श्रेणी	तत्संबंधी भारत में मानक का संख्या एवं शीर्षक	मानक बिन्हु के डिजाइन का आर्थिक विवरण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. क्रम केवल SI : 1783 (भाग I)	बड़ा क्रम बड़ा सिर वाले	IS : 1783 (भाग I) 1983 बड़ा सिर वाले बड़े क्रम की विशिष्ट, भाग 1 श्रेणी ए क्रम	भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें स्तंभ (2) में दिखाई गई निश्चित पैली और परस्पर सम्बद्ध अनुपात में "ISI" धतर बनाए गए हैं, डिजाइन में दिखाए अनुसार मोनोग्राम के ऊपर शब्द "केवल क्रम" अंकित है और मोनोग्राम के नीचे भारतीय मानक की संख्या और उसकी भाग संख्या अंकित है।	

DRAW ONLY



(S. 1783/PART I)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2 ड्रम केवल IS : 1783 (भाग II)  IS:1783 (PART 2)	बड़ा ड्रम बड़े सिरे	IS : 1783 (भाग 2) 1983 बड़े सिरे वाले बड़े ड्रम की विनिष्ट भाग 2 श्रेणी बी ड्रम	भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें स्तंभ (2) में दिखाई गई विनिष्ट सेमी और परस्पर सम्बद्ध अनुपात में "ISI" अक्षर बनाए गए हैं, डिजाइन में दिखाए अनुसार मोनोग्राम के ऊपर शब्द "केवल ड्रम" अंकित हैं और मोनोग्राम के नीचे भारतीय मानक की संख्या और भाग संख्या अंकित है।	
3 ड्रम केवल IS : 1783 (भाग III)  IS:1783 (PART 3)	वही	IS : 1783 (भाग 3) 1983 बड़े सिरे वाले बड़े ड्रम की विनिष्ट, भाग 3 श्रेणी सी ड्रम	वही	

[सं. सीएमडी/13 : 9]

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Deptt. of Civil Supplies)




INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1986

S. O. 3972—In partial modification of the then Ministry of Civil Supplies and Co-operation (Indian Standards Institution) notification number S. O. 1360 dated 1978-04-24 published in the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section-3, Sub-Section (ii) dated 1978-05-13, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that the design of the Standard Mark for drums has been revised. The revised designs of the Standard Mark(s) together with the title of the relevant Indian Standard and verbal description of the designs are given in the following Schedule.

These Standard Mark(s) for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 1985-01-01:

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Product	No. & Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal Description of the Design of the Standard Mark
1.	 IS:1783 (PART 1)	Drum large, fixed ends	IS : 1783 (Part 1)—1983 Specification for drums, large, fixed ends : Part I grade A Drum	The monograms of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI' drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in
2.	 IS:1783 (PART 2)	-do-	IS : 1783 (Part 2)—1983 Specification for drums, large, fixed ends : Part 2 grade B Drum	Col. (2); the words 'DRUM ONLY' being superscribed on the top side and the number of the Indian Standard, alongwith its part being subscribed under the bottom side of the monogram as indicated in the designs
3.	 IS:1783 (PART 3)	-do-	IS : 1783 (Part 3)—1983 Specification for drums, large, fixed ends : Part 3 grade C Drum	

[No. CMD/13 : 9]

का. भा. 3973—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन बिहान) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 14 के उप-विनियम (4) के अनुसार अधिस्तुतित किया जाता है कि प्रमाणन मुहर लगाने के लाइसेंस, जिसके विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं स्तम्भ 6 में दी गयी तिथियों में गतावधि हो गये या उनका नवीकरण स्थगित कर दिया गया है :

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस सं.	लाइसेंस जारी का नाम व पता	संख्या	राजपथ की एसओसं. और तिथि जिसमें लाइसेंस की संख्या की सूचना छपी थी	विवरण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	गतावधि लाइसेंस				
1.	सीएम/एन-0013211 1959-06-24	इ. कार्ल. डी. पेरी (इंडिया) लि., मद्रास 600001	IS : 564—1975		नवीकरण 1981-05-31 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।

1	2	3	4	5	6
2. सी.एम./एल-0023214 1960-10-17	असम लाइव्ड प्रोडक्ट्स, पो. डा. जेधोर, जिला लखीमपुर, (असम)	IS: 10 (भाग 2) 1976	एस.ओ. 2659 मिति 1960-11-05	नवीकरण 1981-01-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
3. सी.एम./एल-0097546 1984-11-30	देवीप्रसाद एल्युमिनियम इंडस्ट्रीज प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, गाजियाबाद (यू.पी.)	IS: 1660 (भाग 1) 1967 IS: 1660 (भाग 2) 1972 IS: 1660 (भाग 3) 1972 IS: 1660 (भाग 4) 1977	एस.ओ. 3539 मिति 1963-12-21	1981-10-15 के बाद गतावधि है।	
4. सी.एम./एल-0137229 1986-12-26	इंपीरियल स्टोर्स एंड एजेंसी कंपनी, कलकत्ता 700006	IS: 10 (भाग 4) 1976	एस.ओ. 243 मिति 1967-01-21	1980-12-31 के बाद गतावधि है।	
5. सी.एम./एल-0165133 1968-03-11	हिन्दू विटैमिक लि., कलकत्ता 700001	IS: 651-1971	एस.ओ. 1470 मिति 1968-04-27	नवीकरण 1979-03-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
6. सी.एम./एल-0195950 1989-04-30	असम टिबर कर्नल, आफसर मरचेरिता, जिला लखीमपुर, (असम)	IS: 10 (भाग 2) 1976	एस.ओ. 2238 मिति 1969-06-07	नवीकरण 1981-01-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
7. सी.एम./एल-0204319 1969-08-06	कीन वेस्टीसाइड्स (प्रा.) लि., मेडिकल आफसर (बाया) पेम्पसबूर, केरल	IS: 561 1978	एस.ओ. 3930 मिति 1969-09-27	1981-01-15 के बाद गतावधि है।	
8. सी.एम./एल-0209632 1969-09-30	ट्रावन्कोर ट्रेड्स एंड एजेंसिया, कोट्टायम 686001	IS: 10 (भाग 4) 1976	एस.ओ. 4310 मिति 1969-10-25	नवीकरण 1981-05-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
9. सी.एम./एल-0221703 1970-01-22	बनिक मित्र (प्रा.) लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता 700008	IS: 10 (भाग 4) 1976	एस.ओ. 771 मिति 1970-02-28	1980-08-31 के बाद गतावधि	
10. सी.एम./एल-0228434 1970-03-20	असम रेगुलेशन एंड ट्रेडिंग कं. लि., डा. घर मरचेरिता, लखीमपुर, डिब्रूगढ़ (असम)	IS: 20 (भाग 3) 1974	एस.ओ. 1508 मिति 1970-04-25	नवीकरण 1979-03-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
11. सी.एम./एल-0238635 1970-07-13	कोस्टल इंजी. कं., कोचीन 682005	IS: 10 (भाग 4) 1976	एस.ओ. 2109 मिति 1971-05-29	नवीकरण 1981-06-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
12. सी.एम./एल-0239136 1970-08-18	बाहू मेडीकल एंड सर्जिकल कं. लि. बडोया 390001	IS: 3317-1975	एस.ओ. 57 मिति 1971-01-02	नवीकरण 1979-08-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
13. सी.एम./एल-0264539 1971-03-30	गिरिनागर कोरेक्ट प्रोडक्ट्स लिमिटेड, जिला शिवसागर (असम) डा. घर. सफरी 785089	IS: 10 (भाग 2) 1976	एस.ओ. 2405 मिति 1971-06-19	नवीकरण 1978-11-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
14. सी.एम./एल-0288844 1971-04-27	बंगलोर वेस्टीसाइड्स लिमिटेड, बंगलोर	IS: 561-1978	एस.ओ. 3741 मिति 1971-10-09	1981-10-31 के बाद गतावधि।	
15. सी.एम./एल-02881846 1971-04-22	—संशोधन—	IS: 633-1975	एस.ओ. 3741 मिति 1971-10-09	1981-10-31 के बाद गतावधि।	
16. सी.एम./एल-0269650 1971-06-07	भारत सीमेंट बाटरफ्लाई, रिजर्व कं., कलकत्ता - 700032	IS: 2645-1975	एस.ओ. 3594 मिति 1971-10-02	नवीकरण 1978-10-31 के बाद गतावधि हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
17. सी.एम./एल-0270231 1971-06-15	जोसी स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि., पूना - 411601	IS: 1786-1979	एस.ओ. 3594 मिति 1971-10-02	नवीकरण 1980-06-30 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी मिति से गतावधि है।	
18. सी.एम./एल-00274239 1971-08-18	स्टील कंभोरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लि., कानपुर	IS: 1786-1979	एस.ओ. 5031 मिति 1971-11-06	1980-08-15 के बाद गतावधि है।	

1	2	3	4	5	6
19. सी एम/एल-0276243 1971-09-13.	जोनी एस्पान इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि., पूना	IS : 226 --- 1975	एस.ओ. 2403 तिथि 1972-09-02	नवीकरण 1980-06-30 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
20. सी एम/एल-0301822 1972-03-30	केमल कार्पोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया लि., बम्बई 400066	IS : 694 --- 1977	एस.ओ. 887 तिथि 1973-03-24	1981-10-31 के बाद गतावधि।	
21. सी एम/एल-0345741 1973-06-28	रिवाइज्ड सरंजम कार्पोरेशन, मुम्बनेस्वर - 1	IS : 1515 --- 1969	एस.ओ. 1037 तिथि 1975-04-05	1981-06-30 के बाद गतावधि।	
22. सी एम/एल-0370134 1974-02-06	किलोपेस्ट प्रा. लि., मोपाल - 462023 (म.प्र.)	IS : 2567 --- 1979	एस.ओ. 2082 तिथि 1975-07-05	नवीकरण 1979-10-31 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
23. सी एम/एल-0408840 1974-12-12	इंडियन नैशनल डीजल इंजनों. लि., कलकत्ता - 700043	IS : 1601 --- 1980	एस.ओ. 2286 1976-07-03	1981-12-15 के बाद गतावधि।	
24. सी एम/एल-0429242 1975-04-08	उत्कल पेस्टीसाइड्स एंड केमिकल्स, जगन्नाथपुर, जिला गंजम (उड़ीसा)	IS : 2567 --- 1978	एस.ओ. 3550 तिथि 1976-10-09	1981-04-15 के बाद गतावधि।	
25. सी एम/एल-0429343 1975-04-08	-पथोपति-	IS : 633 --- 1975	एस.ओ. 3550 तिथि 1976-10-09	नवीकरण 1981-04-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
26. सी एम/एल-0456351 1975-08-11	स्टील (इंडिया) प्रा. लि., औरंगाबाद-431001	IS : 6003 --- 1970	एस.ओ. 428 तिथि 1977-02-05	नवीकरण 1980-06-30 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
27. सी एम/एल-0462442 1975-09-12	उत्कल पेस्टीसाइड्स एंड केमिकल्स, जगन्नाथपुर, जिला गंजम, (उड़ीसा)	IS : 5279 --- 1969	एस.ओ. 832 तिथि 1977-03-19	1981-09-15 के बाद गतावधि।	
28. सी एम/एल-0475451 1975-10-27	पेस्टीसाइड्स एंड केमि. लि., धाने-400607 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 2567 --- 1978	एस.ओ. 1148 तिथि 1977-04-16	नवीकरण 1980-02-30 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
29. सी एम/एल-0475956 1975-10-29	नाउबर्न इंस्टीट्यूट्स एंड फर्टिलाइजर्स, मद्रास-600018 (तमिलनाडू)	IS : 1307 --- 1973	एस.ओ. 1148 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-10-31 के बाद गतावधि।	
30. सी एम/एल-0479762 1975-11-24	स्वास्तिक इंडस्ट्रीज, हैदराबाद	IS : 916 --- 1975	एस.ओ. 1147 तिथि 1977-04-16	नवीकरण 1978-12-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
31. सी एम/एल-0482347 1975-11-24	ओसनर केमिकल्स प्रा. लि., पो. ओ. सुग्गा, गाँव पबने, जिला धाने (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 7193 --- 1974	एस.ओ. 1147 तिथि 1977-04-16	नवीकरण 1978-12-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
32. सी एम/एल-0483858 1975-12-04	पेट्रोबिस एंड कं., कलकत्ता-700013	IS : 7406 --- 1974	एस.ओ. 3083 तिथि 1977-10-08	नवीकरण 1980-11-30 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
33. सी एम/एल-0493655 1976-01-01	सोनावाला इंडस्ट्रीज लि., बम्बई-400002	IS : 266 --- 1977	एस.ओ. 1312 तिथि 1977-05-07	1980-12-31 के बाद गतावधि।	
34. सी एम/एल-0493857 1976-01-01	इंस्ट्रूमेंट और योपेक्टिड लि., धाने (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 5395 --- 1969 IS : 5846 --- 1970	एस.ओ. 1312 तिथि 1977-05-07	नवीकरण 1980-01-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
35. सी एम/एल-0496055 1976-01-15	नागार्जुन फास्टेड प्रोडक्ट्स, लिमिटेड, पो. ओ. तिजील, बाया सोनारी जिला मोन (नागालैंड)	IS : 16 (भाग 2) --- 1976	एस.ओ. 1312 तिथि 1977-05-07	1981-03-31 के बाद गतावधि।	
36. सी एम/एल-0502933 1976-02-26	नारायण केमिकल्स एंड पेस्टीसाइड्स, बोम्बेयसर (एम.एम.)-401501	IS : 562 --- 1978	एस.ओ. 3441 तिथि 1978-10-02	1981-02-29 के बाद गतावधि।	
37. सी एम/एल-0509846 1976-03-31	मानसिका इंडस्ट्रीज, लिमिटेड, बम्बई-400020 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 916 --- 1975	एस.ओ. 12 तिथि 1979-01-06	1981-02-28 के बाद गतावधि।	

1	2	3	4	5	6
38.	सी एम/एल-0511530 1976-04-01	स्टार रबड़ प्रॉडक्ट्स, पूणे-411018	IS: 3976—1975	एस.ओ. 314 तिथि 1979-01-27	नवीकरण 1981-06-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
39.	सी एम/एल-0513635 1976-04-19	मैकाल स्टील लिमिटेड, बम्बई-400066	IS: 2141—1968	एस.ओ. 314 तिथि 1979-01-27	नवीकरण 1980-04-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
40.	सी एम/एल-0516237 1976-04-29	एकमशी स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लिमिटेड बंगलौर-560027	IS: 1977—1975	एस.ओ. 314 तिथि 1979-01-27	1981-10-31 के बाद गतावधि।
41.	सी एम/एल-0529650 1976-06-14	मैकाल प्लास्टिक्स इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लिमिटेड, तिनसुकिया (असम)	IS: 219 (भाग 1)— 1973 और IS: 2202 (भाग 1) 1973	एस.ओ. 1274 तिथि 1979-04-21	नवीकरण 1981-06-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
42.	सी एम/एल-0532235 1976-06-28	कृषि रसायन, मैकाल हाइले सं. 5, पो.ओ. रैनीतन, जिला बालासोर (उड़ीसा)	IS: 633—1975	एस.ओ. 1274 तिथि 1979-04-21	1981-06-30 के बाद गतावधि
43.	सी एम/एल-0545446 1976-08-30	नेपथ्यून इमेक्टिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, बम्बई-400013	IS: 2148—1968	एस.ओ. 3548 तिथि 1979-10-20	नवीकरण 1980-10-31 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
44.	सी एम/एल-0548149 1976-09-08	प्लास्टोई इंडिया, पो.ओ. जिला बिबनगर (असम)	IS: 10 (भाग 2)— 1976	एस.ओ. 3548 तिथि 1979-10-20	नवीकरण 1980-09-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
45.	सी एम/एल-0550641 1976-09-20	एलाएक्स मिल्स लेमिस प्रा. लिमिटेड, जगदल-743125 24 परगना (पं.प्र.)	IS: 7407—1974	एस.ओ. 3549 तिथि 1979-10-20	नवीकरण 1981-09-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
46.	सी एम/एल-0554548 1976-10-04	श्रीनिवास स्टील लिमिटेड, पो.ओ. बिजोली, क्रांसी-284001 (उ.प्र.)	IS: 6914—1978	एस.ओ. 3350 तिथि 1979-10-20	1981-07-31 के बाद गतावधि।
47.	सी एम/एल-0554649 1976-10-04	अजय पेस्टीसाइड्स मैहरेज (उ.प्र.)	IS: 561—1978	एस.ओ. 3550 तिथि 1979-10-20	1981-09-30 के बाद गतावधि।
48.	सी एम/एल-0556956 1976-10-12	एनजीइएफ लिमिटेड, बंगलौर-560038	IS: 6595—1972 और IS: 7538—1975	एस.ओ. 3550 तिथि 1979-10-20	1981-10-15 के बाद गतावधि।
49.	सी एम/एल-0567153 1976-11-30	एसएमपी प्र बम्बई-400060 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 7122—1973	एस.ओ. 3761 तिथि 1979-11-17	1980-12-15 के बाद गतावधि
50.	सी एम/एल-0572853 1976-12-24	विशाल इंजीनियरी भुवनेश्वर-757001 जिला पुरी (उड़ीसा)	IS: 2089—1972	एस.ओ. 3762 तिथि 1979-11-17	1980-12-31 के बाद गतावधि
51.	सी एम/एल-0578764 1976-01-11	मोनारी मा एंड प्लास्टिक्स मोनारी ठाकुर, जिला-शिवसागर (असम)	IS: 10 (भाग 2)— 1976	एस.ओ. 420 तिथि 1980-02-23	1981-01-15 के बाद गतावधि
52.	सी एम/एल-0586258 1977-02-03	श्री गणेश स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स, मद्रास-600019	IS: 226—1975	एस.ओ. 731 तिथि 1980-03-22	नवीकरण 1981-01-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
53.	सी एम/एल-0586864 1977-02-03	सेन स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज हावड़ा-711105	IS: 1977—1975	एस.ओ. 731 तिथि 1980-03-22	नवीकरण 1981-02-15 के बाद स्थगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।

1	2	3	4	5	6
54.	सीएम/एल-0588969 1977-02-28	गवर्नमेंट मिल्क स्कीम, (डेयरी प्रॉडक्ट विभाग) महाराष्ट्र सरकार, मिराज-416410, जिला सांगली, महाराष्ट्र	IS: 1165--1975	एल.ओ. 731 तिथि 1980-03-22	नवीकरण 1980-02-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
55.	सीएम/एल-0590855 1977-02-28	विकटर (इंडिया), फूफन प्रलो, शकधर जोरहट, जिला शिवसागर (अरुण)	IS: 10 (भाग 4)--1976	एल.ओ. 731 तिथि 1980-02-23	नवीकरण 1981-02-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
56.	सीएम/एल-0591150 1977-02-28	कृषि डिस्क प्रॉ. लि. बरेली (उ.प्र.)	IS: 4366 (भाग 1)--1972	एल.ओ. 731 तिथि 1980-03-22	नवीकरण 1981-02-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
57.	सीएम/एल-0591756 1977-02-28	कृष्णा इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज नई दिल्ली-110005	IS: 694--1977	एल.ओ. 731 तिथि 1980-03-22	1981-11-15 के बाद गतावधि
58.	सीएम/एल-0598972 1977-03-24	साउथन स्टीलमेंट एंड एलायज लि., बंगलूर-560048	IS 961--1975	एल.ओ. 787 तिथि 1980-03-29	नवीकरण 1981-03-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
59.	सीएम/एल-598972 1977-03-24	साउथन स्टील एंड एलायज लिमिटेड, बंगलूर-560048	IS: 4432--1967	एल.ओ. 787 तिथि 1980-03-29	नवीकरण 1981-03-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
60.	सीएम/एल-0609146 1977-05-13	मराठावादा इमेकटीमाइड्स एंड पेस्टीसाइड्स, आणे, श्रीरंगाबाद-824101 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 561--1978	एल.ओ. 283 तिथि 1981-01-24	नवीकरण 1980-05-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
61.	सीएम/एल-0609951 1977-05-13	गुटेका केमिकल्स, गोरखपुर-273004	IS: 561--1978	एल.ओ. 283 तिथि 1981-01-24	नवीकरण 1981-04-30 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
62.	सीएम/एल-0612031 1977-05-23	स्वास्तिकी मेटल वर्क्स, अगावरी (हरियाणा)	IS: 1972--1961	एल.ओ. 283 तिथि 1981-01-24	1981-05-15 के बाद गतावधि।
63.	सीएम/एल-0630841 1977-07-30	यूनाइटेड बायर गैस लिमिटेड, बाने-400606 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 3623--1966	एल.ओ. 754 तिथि 1981-03-07	1981-09-13 के बाद गतावधि।
64.	सीएम/एल-0634950 1977-08-16	जादव लैडर वर्क्स, सांगली-416416 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 1889 (भाग 1)--1978 IS: 1889 (भाग 2)--1978	एल.ओ. 755 तिथि 1981-03-07	नवीकरण 1978-12-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
65.	सीएम/एल-0636752 1977-08-24	कृषि रसायन नेशनल हाईवे सं. 5 डॉ. घर गनीताल-756111 जिला बालोसर (उड़ीसा)	IS: 564--1975	एल.ओ. 755 तिथि 1981-03-07	नवीकरण 1981-08-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
66.	सीएम/एल-0637653 1977-08-36	एंकर इंडस्ट्रीज बम्बई-400064	IS: 3854--1966	एल.ओ. 755 तिथि 1981-03-07	1980-08-31 के बाद गतावधि
67.	सीएम/एल-0638352 1977-08-31	नैदर कांप्रिगन ऑफ उड़ीसा लिमिटेड, कटक-753003 (उड़ीसा)	IS: 583--1969	एल.ओ. 755 तिथि 1981-03-07	नवीकरण 1978-08-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
68.	सीएम/एल-0638453 1977-08-31	एच.ओ.एल.	IS: 578--1971	एल.ओ. 755 तिथि 1981-03-07	नवीकरण 1979-11-30 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।

1	2	3	4	5	6
69.	सीएम/एन-0642040 1977-09-21	एम०पी०आर०ईजी० नर्स, बटाया (पंजाब)	IS: 1729-1964	एम०ओ० 920 तिथि 1981-03-21	1981-09-30 के बाद गतावधि
70.	सीएम/एन-0647757 1977-10-24	गोबिन्द स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज, हावड़ा	IS: 1977-1975	एम०ओ० 921 तिथि 1981-03-21	नवीकरण 1981-02-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
71.	सीएम/एन-0648456 1977-10-28	भारत इंडस्ट्रीज, बुजफरपुर-842001 (बिहार)	IS: 6595-1972	एम०ओ० 921 तिथि 1981-03-21	1979-10-15 के बाद गतावधि
72.	सीएम/एन-0649761 1977-10-31	असम बेल्स प्लाईवुड (प्रा०) लि०, कलकत्ता-700017	IS: 2202 (भाग-1)- 1973	एम०ओ० 921 तिथि 1981-03-21	नवीकरण 1981-10-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
73.	सीएम/एन-0650140 1977-10-31	उत्कल पेट्रोलाइड्स एंड केमिकल्स, जगन्नाथपुर, जिला-गंजम (उड़ीसा)	IS: 4323-1967	एम०ओ० 921 तिथि 1981-03-21	नवीकरण 1978-10-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
74.	सीएम/एन-0667258 1978-01-16	एम०बी० मुबर्का एंड क० बंगलौर-560044 (कर्नाटक)	IS: 6248-1971	एम०ओ० 1615 तिथि 1981-05-30	नवीकरण 1981-01-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
75.	सीएम/एन-0683559 1978-03-07	पेन्टिल इलेक्ट्रानिक्स प्रा० लि० कामोडी, बाजबेल जिला-कोलार (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 325-1978	एम०ओ० 1664 तिथि 1981-06-06	नवीकरण 1981-03-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
76.	सीएम/एन-0688161 1978-03-17	जय इलेक्ट्रालाइड्स उताव	IS: 561-1978	एम०ओ० 1664 तिथि 1981-06-06	नवीकरण 1981-03-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
77.	सीएम/एन-0686464 1978-05-29	टंककवाइट प्लास्टिक लिमिटेड, कांयंबटूर-641004 (त०ना०)	IS: 5225-1969	एम०ओ० 1664 तिथि 1981-06-06	1981-10-15 के बाद गतावधि,
78.	सीएम/एन-0702032 1978-05-29	कमल इंडस्ट्रीज, विलर्रा-110035	IS: 7406-1974	एम०ओ० 2003 तिथि 1981-07-25	नवीकरण 1981-05-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
79.	सीएम/एन-0705442 1978-06-19	राजेंद्र इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा० लि० बम्बई-400058 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 7538-1975	एम०ओ० 2002 तिथि 1981-07-25	1981-03-31 के बाद गतावधि
80.	सीएम/एन-0705543 1978-06-19	कनाटक एप्रो, केमिकल्स, बंगलौर (कर्नाटक)	IS: 561-1978	एम०ओ० 2002 तिथि 1981-07-25	नवीकरण 1981-07-31 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
81.	सीएम/एन-0708145 1978-06-28	सुन्दर टिन फैक्टरी रोहतास (हरियाणा)	IS: 916-1975	एम०ओ० 2002 तिथि 1981-07-25	1981-03-31 के बाद गतावधि,
82.	सीएम/एन-0719049 1978-08-31	कोल्हापुर आटा नर्स कोल्हापुर-416001 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 6595-1972	एम०ओ० 2180 तिथि 1981-08-15	नवीकरण 1981-10-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
83.	सीएम/एन-0719353 1978-08-31	रोलीम इंडिया लिमिटेड मद्रास-600058 (त०ना०)	IS: 2862-1964	एम०ओ० 2180 तिथि 1981-08-15	1981-09-15 के बाद गतावधि,
84.	सीएम/एन-0720034 1978-09-11	सुपर इंडिया मेथ क० (प्रा०) लि०, मिलबर, कचर (असम)	IS: 10 (भाग-3)- 1974	एम०ओ० 2215 तिथि 1981-08-15	नवीकरण 1980-09-15 के बाद स्वगित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
85.	सीएम/एल-0722644 1978-09-18	इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोफाईट्स हैदराबाद	IS:1305-1967,	एस.ओ. 2215 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-09-30 के बाद गतावधि
86.	सीएम/एल-724850 1978-10-03	प्लास्टिक केमिकल एंड प्लास्टिक प्रां. लि., बाण-400604 (महाराष्ट्र) (महाराष्ट्र)	IS:958-1975	एस.ओ. 2215 तिथि 1980-8-22	नवीकरण 1980-09-30 के बाद स्थापित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
87.	सीएम/एल-07278560 1978-10-18	संकेत प्र. लि., मुंबई-751410	IS:261-1966	एस.ओ. 2218 तिथि 1981-08-22	नवीकरण 1980-10-31 के बाद स्थापित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
88.	सीएम/एल-0729961 1978-10-30	कश्मीर मिरेमिक प्रोडक्ट्स, प्रां. लि. गांधी, सिरा-401104 जिला, बाण	IS:651-1979	एस.ओ. 2218 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-10-31 के बाद गतावधि
89.	सीएम/एल-0731645 1978-11-07	कोरमंडल इंडिया प्राइवेट्स (प्रां.) लि., मद्रास-600019 (ता. ना.)	IS:4322-1967	एस.ओ. 2270 तिथि 1981-08-29	1981-11-15 के बाद गतावधि
90.	सीएम/एल-0733851 1978-11-13	प्रोसेट आयरन एंड स्टील कारपोरेशन लि. बम्बई-400063 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS:325-1978	एस.ओ. 2270 तिथि 1981-08-29	1980-11-15 के बाद गतावधि
91.	सीएम/एल-0736554 1978-11-23	एनालुल इंडस्ट्रीज इंडिया प्रां.- 400607	IS:633-1975	एस.ओ. 2270 तिथि 1981-08-29	1981-11-30 के बाद गतावधि
92.	सीएम/एल-0738356 1978-12-04	बरकासी प्रां. लि., बम्बई-400063	IS:2548-1967	एस.ओ. 2270 तिथि 1981-08-29	1981-11-30 के बाद गतावधि
93.	सीएम/एल-752754 1979-02-07	मल्टिप्लेक्स एंड इंड. प्रां. लि.- ग्रहमदाबाद-382330 (गुजरात)	IS:7122-1973	एस.ओ. 2310 तिथि 1981-09-03	1981-02-15 के बाद गतावधि
94.	सीएम/एल-0753655 1979-02-16	रामकृष्ण बंधू, मान गांधी-423203, जिला-नासिक, (महाराष्ट्र)	IS:4359-1967	एस.ओ. 2310 तिथि 1981-09-05,	1981-02-28 के बाद गतावधि
95.	सीएम/एल-0754960 1979-02-21	हैरी प्रोडक्ट्स प्राइवेट, नया बम्बई, (महाराष्ट्र)	IS:1222-1973	एस.ओ. 2310 तिथि 1981-09-05	1981-03-31 के बाद गतावधि
96.	सीएम/एल-0763658 1979-03-22	मल्टिप्लेक्स एंड इंड. प्रां. लि., ग्रहमदाबाद-283330, (गुजरात)	IS:633-1975	एस.ओ. 2585 तिथि 1981-10-03.	1981-03-31 के बाद गतावधि
97.	सीएम/एल-0768163 1979-03-30	बौधरी इंडस्ट्रीज, मिलीगुड़ी एक्विनास, जिला, दार्जिलिंग	IS:10 (भाग 3)- 1974	एस.ओ. 2825 तिथि 1981-10-03	नवीकरण 1981-04-15 के बाद स्थापित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
98.	सीएम/एल-0786872 1979-07-19	मधु एलायड एंडो केमिकल्स कार्पो. कोपुरापुर-522508 जिला गढ़र,	IS:633-1973	एस.ओ. 3443 तिथि 1981-12-26	1981-07-31 के बाद गतावधि
99.	सीएम/एल-0787167 1979-07-20	जे. ए. इंडो. वर्क्स, हाबड़ा	IS:4310-1967	एस.ओ. 3443 तिथि 1981-12-26	1981-07-31 के बाद गतावधि
100.	सीएम/एल-0789979 1979-08-02	जैम पेट्स, भुवनेश्वर, (पंजाब)	IS:427-1965	एस.ओ. 3466 तिथि 1981-12-26	1981-08-15 के बाद गतावधि
101.	सीएम/एल-0792423 1979-08-10	राम फाउंडरी, कोयंबटूर-641037 (तमिलनाडु)	IS:1995-1972	एस.ओ. 3466 तिथि 1981-12-26	नवीकरण 1981-08-15 के बाद स्थापित हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।
102.	सीएम/एल-0793364 1979-08-20	एग्रो इंडस्ट्रियल केमिकल्स कम्पनी, रुध्रपुर, जिला नैनीताल-623153 (उ.प्र.)	IS:561-1978	एस.ओ. 3466 तिथि 1981-12-26	1981-08-31 के बाद गतावधि
103.	सीएम/एल-0796269 1979-08-27	जय भारत हाइड्रोपॉवर कं., वासीपत	IS:280-1978	एस.ओ. 3466 तिथि 1981-12-26	1981-08-31 के बाद गतावधि
104.	सीएम/एल-0800133 1979-09-14	कोरमंडल इंडिया प्राइवेट्स प्रां. लि., मद्रास-600019 (ता. ना.)	IS:2568-1978	एस.ओ. 1772 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-09-30 के बाद गतावधि
105.	सीएम/एल-0804444 1979-09-28	आरटी स्टील्स गांधी शेखपुर कलान, लुधियाना (पंजाब)	IS:226-1975	एस.ओ. 1772 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-10-15 के बाद गतावधि
106.	सीएम/एल-0809353 1979-10-29	बंगलोर पेस्टीसाईड्स लिमिटेड, बंगलोर-562139, (कर्नाटक)	IS:2682-1966	एस.ओ. 1771 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-11-15 के बाद गतावधि
107.	सीएम/एल-0809656 1979-10-29	नेको इंडीनिमिड कं. लिमिटेड, बडोदा	IS:1786-1984	एस.ओ. 1771 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-11-15 के बाद गतावधि

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
108. सीएस/एल-0838258 1980-02-20	टेकनिकी कणकला-700002	IS: 940-1976	एस. प्रो. 3445 तिथि 1982-10-02	नवीकरण 1981-03-15 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
109. सीएस/एल-0846258 1980-03-11	नंदी सी-रोलिंग मिल्स, प्रा० लि० बंगलौर-560077	IS: 226-1975	एस. प्रो. 4452 तिथि 1983-12-10	नवीकरण 1981-03-15 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
110. सीएस/एल-0851049 1980-02-35	नार्थ बंगाल फ्लाइंग इंजिनरीज, राकमर, गुमिनयामाल (जिल्लागुडी)	IS: 10(भाग-3) 1974	एस. प्रो. 4452 तिथि 1983-12-10	नवीकरण 1981-03-31 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
111. सीएस/एल-0859267 1980-03-21	रवि पेट्रोल एंड केमिकल्स लि० मद्रास-600001	5410-1969	एस. प्रो. 4452 तिथि 1983-12-10	नवीकरण 1981-04-15 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
112. सीएस/एल-0888369 1980-05-09	प्रोमियर टिम्बर एंड फ्लाइंग प्राइवेट लि० जिला-जलपाईगुडी	IS: 10(भाग-3)- 1974	एस. प्रो. 4460 तिथि 1983-12-10	नवीकरण 1981-04-15 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
113. सीएस/एल-0869573 1980-06-19	बिलसन केमिकल्स मद्रास	IS: 266-1977	एस. प्रो. 4460 तिथि 1983-12-10	1981-05-31 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उस तिथि से गतावधि है।	
114. सीएस/एल-0869977 1980-05-20	—यथावधि—	IS: 264-1976	एस. प्रो. 4460 तिथि 1983-12-10	1981-05-31 के बाद गतावधि	
115. सीएस/एल-0882686 1980-07-23	कृष्ण स्टील इंडो. बाणो	IS: 1977-1975	एस. प्रो. 4533 तिथि 1983-12-17	नवीकरण 1981-07-31 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
116. सीएस/एल-0885874 1980-07-31	माडन केमिकल्स डामनवर, रोपोनेट-577426, जिला शिमोगा (कर्नाटक)	IS: 2518-1978	एस. प्रो. 4533 तिथि 1983-12-17	नवीकरण 1981-08-15 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
117. सीएस/एल-0886674 1980-07-31	—यथावधि—	IS: 7121-1973	एस. प्रो. 4533 तिथि 1983-12-17	नवीकरण 1981-08-15 के बाद स्थिति हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतावधि है।	
118. सीएस/एल-0886775 1980-07-31	मेरठ एंडो-केमिकल्स इंजिनरीज, मेरठ	IS: 561-1978	एस. प्रो. 4531 तिथि 1983-12-17	1981-07-31 के बाद गतावधि	
119. सीएस/एल-0889276 1980-08-18	जोबन फूड्स इंदरनाथ	IS: 1011-1978	एस. प्रो. 4531 तिथि 1983-12-17	1981-08-31 के बाद गतावधि	
120. सीएस/एल-0890968 1980-08-20	डी सी स्टील रोलिंग एंड ग्राइंग मिल्स, गुमनऊ	IS: 1977-1975	एस. प्रो. 4531 तिथि 1983-12-17	1981-08-31 के बाद गतावधि	
121. सीएस/एल-0891263 1980-08-21	उर्बा इंडस्ट्रियल लि (पिंभन धार्मिक रसायन प्रभाग) धार्म	IS: 1827-1961	एस. प्रो. 4531 तिथि 1983-12-17	1981-08-31 के बाद गतावधि	
122. सीएस/एल-0894370 1980-08-29	माडन केमिकल्स, डामनवर रोपोनेट-577426 जिला शिमोगा	IS: 1507-1977	एस. प्रो. 4531 तिथि 1983-12-17	1981-09-15 के बाद गतावधि	
123. सीएस/एल-0900541 1980-09-24	सिंथेकेम लिमिटेड जिला—धर्मा	IS: 7121-1973	एस. प्रो. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-09-30 के बाद गतावधि	
124. सीएस/एल-0903850 1980-10-07	सरदार रोलिंग मिल्स मयसोर	IS: 226-1975	एस. प्रो. 4613 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-10-15 के बाद गतावधि	
125. सीएस/एल-0904448 1980-10-10	तारापुर केमिकल्स एंड पेस्टीसाइड्स, बोइजर-401501 जिला—बाणो (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 565-1975	एस. प्रो. 4613 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-10-15 के बाद गतावधि	
126. सीएस/एल-0906856 1980-10-14	व पंजाब डेयरी डेवलपमेंट कार्पो. लि., बेरका, जिला—धर्मपुर (पंजाब)	IS: 1547-1968	एस. प्रो. 4613 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-10-31 के बाद गतावधि	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
127. सीएम/एल-0907252 1980-10-21	श्री गणेश स्टील रोलिंग मिल, भद्राग	IS: 1786-1979	एल.ओ. 4613 तिथि 1983-12-24	नवीकरण 1981-10-31 के बाद स्वयं हो गया और लाइसेंस अब उसी तिथि से गतान्वित है। के बाद स्वयं	
लाइसेंस रद्दगिन					
128. सीएम/एल-0012916 1959-06-23	द आकाशी एंड कमिजल कार्पोरेशन आफ इंडिया लिमिटेड कलकत्ता-700016	IS: 632-1978	---	1981-10-31	
129. सीएम/एल-00189923 1980-04-27	गौतम इलेक्ट्रिक मोटर्स प्रा लि नई दिल्ली-110020	IS: 325-1978	एल.ओ. 1187 तिथि 1960-05-14	1981-10-31	
130. सीएम/एल-0038530 1962-02-14	घनम या मिल्स एंड डिस्चार्ज कं. लि. कलकत्ता-19	IS: 10 (भाग-2)	एल.ओ. 751 तिथि 1962-03-17	1981-10-31	
131. सीएम/एल-0071225 1964-06-29	सांगनेरिया कं., प्रा. लि. कलकत्ता-700007	IS: 226-1975	एल.ओ. 2590 तिथि 1964-03-01	1981-10-31	
132. सीएम/एल-0071326 1964-06-29	---यथोपरि---	IS: 1977-1975	एल.ओ. 2590 तिथि 1964-08-10	1981-10-31	
133. सीएम/एल-0084638 1964-11-28	कंकबाहा कं. लि. भरमपारा	IS: 2818 (भाग-2) 1971 एंड IS: 3790-1971	एल.ओ. 79 तिथि 1965-01-02	1981-11-30	
134. सीएम/एल-0086036 1964-11-28	इलहासी जूट कं. लिमिटेड खाम्बावानी	IS: 2818 (भाग-2) 1971	एल.ओ. 79 तिथि 1965-01-02	1981-12-31	
135. सीएम/एल-0094641 1964-11-28	गंगेज मल्लिकार्जुन कं., जिला-हुगली (पं. बंगाल)	IS: 2566-1965 एंड IS: 3667-1966	एल.ओ. 79 तिथि 1965-01-02	1981-11-30	
136. सीएम/एल-0114621 1965-09-17	निलहा स्टील एंड बर्न कं. लि. हावड़ा	IS: 226-1975	एल.ओ. 3324 तिथि 1965-10-23	1981-10-15	
137. सीएम/एल-114722 1965-09-17	---यथोपरि---	IS: 1977-1975	एल.ओ. 3324 तिथि 1965-10-23	1981-10-15	
138. सीएम/एल-0121820 1966-03-02	युनाइटेड कार्बन रोस लिमिटेड भागी	IS: 1853-1977 एंड IS: 1856-1977	एल.ओ. 1263 तिथि 1966-04-23	1981-09-15	
139. सीएम/एल-0127428 1966-05-31	सुर आयरन एंड स्टील कं. प्रा. लि बेलूर, हावड़ा	IS: 1851-1975	एल.ओ. 1799 तिथि 1966-06-18	1981-10-15	
140. सीएम/एल-0166236 1968-03-27	छोलिहा रोलिंग मिल्स प्रा. लि. 5 मिशन रो, कलकत्ता-700001	IS: 280-1978	एल.ओ. 1470 तिथि 1968-04-27	1981-11-30	
141. सीएम/एल-017644 1968-08-19	प्रकाश एंड कं. नई दिल्ली	IS: 1703-1977	एल.ओ. 3877 1968-10-19	1981-10-31	
142. सीएम/एल-0181030 1968-10-14	सोनाभा एंड वेकल लिमिटेड महाराष्ट्र	IS: 2266-1977	एल.ओ. 4257 तिथि 1968-11-30	1981-09-30	
143. सीएम/एल-0191437 1969-02-07	व जतरल इंजी. कं. कोयम्बटूर-641011 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 325-1978	एल.ओ. 1256 तिथि 1968-04-05	1981-11-15	
144. सीएम/एल-0191639 1969-02-13	बी. डी. सेतान एंड कं. कलकत्ता-700001	IS: 561-1978	एल.ओ. 2558 तिथि 1969-04-05	1981-10-31	
145. सीएम/एल-0203822 1969-07-02	मैनीफैक्ट इंडिया प्रा. लि. हावड़ा	IS: 774-1971	एल.ओ. 3585 तिथि 1969-09-06	1981-09-30	
146. सीएम/एल-0275443 1971-08-27	इंडस्ट्रियल कंटेनर्स लि. कलकत्ता	IS: 1783-1974	एल.ओ. 5031 तिथि 1971-11-06	1981-09-15	
147. सीएम/एल-0322325 1972-11-28	विडीकेम लिमिटेड, तहसील और जिला बर्मा	IS: 581-1978	एल.ओ. 1700 तिथि 1973-06-18	1981-11-30	
148. सीएम/एल-0322527 1972-11-28	---यथोपरि---	IS: 564-1975	एल.ओ. 1700 तिथि 1973-06-18	1981-11-30	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
149.	सी एम/एल-0322630 1972-11-30	—यथोपरि—	IS: 2567—1978	एस.ओ. 1700 तिथि 1973-08-16	1981-11-30
150.	सी एम/एल-0328135 1973-01-08	कलकत्ता कंटेनर्स एंड प्रिंटिंग वर्क्स, कलकत्ता	IS: 10(भाग 4)— 1976	एस.ओ. 1788 तिथि 1974-0-720	1981-09-15
151.	सी एम/एल-0395756 1974-09-19	ग्रसम बेसी प्लास्टिक्स प्रा. लि., तिनमुकिया (ग्रसम),	IS: 303—1975	एस.ओ. 1762 तिथि 1976-05-29	1981-09-30
152.	सी एम/एल-0396758 1974-09-25	लेखापानी बेनीर एंड सा मिल्स, ग्रसम	IS: 10(भाग 2)— 1976	एस.ओ. 1762 तिथि 1976-05-29	1981-10-31
153.	सी एम/एल-0406330 1974-11-25	मेटल इंडी. एंड कं. कलकत्ता-700002	IS: 10(भाग-4)— 1976	एस.ओ. 2022 तिथि 1976-06-19	1981-11-30
154.	सी एम/एल-0425739 1975-03-07	नेशनल प्लास्टिक्स इंडी. प्रा. लि. तिनमुकिया-785125 ग्रसम	IS: 10(भाग-2)— 1976	एस.ओ. 2022 तिथि 1976-06-19	1981-11-30
155.	सी एम/एल-0469557 1975-09-29	गजेट्स इंडिया फरीदाबाद	IS: 4151—1976	एस.ओ. 832 तिथि 1977-03-19	1981-10-15
156.	सी एम/एल-0469961 1975-10-15	टीटागढ़ पेपर मिल्स कं. लि., टीटागढ़	IS: 1848—1971	एस.ओ. 1148 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-09-30
157.	सी एम/एल-0470037 1975-10-15	टीटागढ़ पेपर मिल्स कं. लि., कांकीनारा	IS: 1848—1971	एस.ओ. 1148 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-09-30
158.	सी एम/एल-0471241 1975-10-15	पुनालूर पेपर मिल्स लिमिटेड, पुनाला, (केरल राज्य)	IS: 7193—1974	एस.ओ. 1148 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-09-30
159.	सी एम/एल-0471746 1975-10-15	रविका केन्स, दिल्ली	IS: 3804—1977	एस.ओ. 1148 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-10-15
160.	सी एम/एल-0478558 1975-10-31	गुप्ता केमिकल्स प्रा. लि. जयपुर-302006	IS: 561—1978	एस.ओ. 1148 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-10-13
161.	सी एम/एल-0482953 1975-11-24	बी. डी. खेतान एंड कं. 24 परगना (प. बं.)	IS: 633—1975	एस.ओ. 1147 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-11-30
162.	सी एम/एल-0483046 1975-11-24	—यथोपरि—	IS: 365—1975	एस.ओ. 1147 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-11-30
163.	सी एम/एल-0484250 1975-11-26	विहू एसाय एंड स्टील लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता-700054	IS: 6914—1978	एस.ओ. 1147 तिथि 1977-04-16	1981-11-30
164.	सी एम/एल-0488763 1975-12-12	मुभागढ़ डबल इंड. प्रा. लि., जिला कोनाका	IS: 4892—1968	एस.ओ. 3083 तिथि 1977-10-08	1981-12-15
165.	सी एम/एल-0489260 1975-12-12	शालीमार तार प्रोडक्ट्स (1935) लि., बम्बई-400078	IS: 7193—1974	एस.ओ. 3083 तिथि 1977-10-08	1981-09-30
166.	सी एम/एल-0491559 1975-12-19	इलहोजी जूट कं. लि., बम्पादानी,	IS: 7407 (भाग-2 और 3)—1980,	एस.ओ. 3083 तिथि 1977-10-08	1981-12-31
167.	सी एम/एल-0516035 1976-04-29	रुक्मणी स्टील इंड. प्रा. लि., बंगलौर	IS: 1786—1979,	एस.ओ. 314 तिथि 1979-01-27	1981-10-31
168.	सी एम/एल-0516136 1976-04-29	—यथोपरि—	IS: 226—1975	एस.ओ. 314 तिथि 1979-01-27	1981-10-31
169.	सी एम/एल-0527242 1976-06-04	सिडीकेट लि., जिला—धर्मा (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 633—1975	एस.ओ. 1274 तिथि 1979-04-21	1981-11-30
170.	सी एम/एल-0529347 1976-06-14	इस्टर्न ट्रेडर्स नई दिल्ली-110028	IS: 417 (भाग-1) —1974 IS: 417(भाग-2)— 1974 IS: 417(भाग-3)— 1974	एस.ओ. 1274 तिथि 1979-04-21	1981-11-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
171.	सी एम/एल-0538954 1976-08-02	हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लि., हैदराबाद	IS: 1786--1966	एस.ओ. 3548 निधि 1979-10-20	1981-07-31
172.	सी एम/एल-0550540 1976-09-20	इ मेनशन इन्फ्रस्ट्रक्चर केबल क., ग्राफ इंडिया लिमिटेड कलकत्ता	IS: 1028--1966	एस.ओ. 3549 निधि 1979-10-20	1981-09-15
173.	सी एम/एल-550944 1976-09-20	मल्लोत्रा एंड हेकल लिमिटेड, बम्बई-400001 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 398(भाग-II)-- 1976	एस.ओ. 3594 दिनांक 1979-10-20	1981-09-30
174.	सी एम/एल-0552443 1976-09-24	मामाशङ्कर रबड़ मैयूफैक्चरिंग को. लि., जिला मालापुरम (केरल)	IS: 4508--1977	एस.ओ. 3549 दिनांक 1979-10-20	1981-09-30
175.	सी एम/एल-0553647 1976-09-24	बी.डी. खेतान एंड कं., कलकत्ता-	IS: 3107--1973,	एस.ओ. 3549 दिनांक 1979-10-20	1981-09-15
176.	सी एम/एल-0556249 1976-10-25	जयलक्ष्मी केमिकल्स एण्ड पुल्वराइज जिला कुरुल (आ.प्र.)	IS: 561--1978	एस.ओ. 3530 दिनांक 1979-10-20	1981-10-15
177.	सी एम/एल-0558758 1976-10-25	इलेक्ट्रो स्टील कास्टिंग लि. परगना जिला (प.बं.)	IS: 1536--1976	एस.ओ. 3550 दिनांक 1979-10-20	1981-10-31
178.	सी एम/एल-0566454 1976-11-24	असम बीनियर (प्रा.) लि. सीडो (असम)	IS: 10(भाग-2)-- 1976	एस.ओ. 3761 दिनांक 1979-11-17	1981-11-15
179.	सी एम/एल-0568357 1976-12-10	जय गुरु इंजीनियरिंग कं. (इंडिया) हावड़ा-711101	IS: 7932--1976	एस.ओ. 3762 दिनांक 1979-11-17	1981-11-30
180.	सी एम/एल-0574352 1976-12-24	खितामणी होत्रगी यूनिट तिरुपुर-636802,	IS: 4964--1980	एस.ओ. 3762 दिनांक 1979-11-17	1981-12-15
181.	सी एम/एल-0575657 1976-12-31	गाउडन इंसेकटीसाइड्स एंड फर्टिलाइजर्स, मद्रास-600098,	IS: 562--1978	एस.ओ. 3762 दिनांक 1979-11-17	1981-12-31
182.	सी एम/एल-0595764 1977-03-21	बैम्पियन इंजीनियर्स, बम्बई-400063	IS: 3734--1964	एस.ओ. 789 दिनांक 1980-03-29	1981-10-15
183.	सी एम/एल-0604941 1977-04-20	मिडिकेम लि., जिला वर्धा (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 3284--1965	एस.ओ. 786 दिनांक 1980-03-29	1981-11-30
184.	सी एम/एल-0610229 1977-05-16	बैम्पियन पेंट फ्लोर एंड बार्निश कं., शाहदरा दिल्ली-110002	IS: 428--1969	एस.ओ. 283 दिनांक 1981-01-24	1981-10-31
185.	सी एम/एल-0639960 1977-09-14	जनरल एलुमिनियम कारपोरेशन, बंगलौर-560022	IS: 205--1978	एस.ओ. 920 दिनांक 1981-03-21	1981-10-31
186.	सी एम/एल-0641240 1977-09-20	स्टैंडर्ड बुश वेयर, कलकत्ता	IS: 384--1971	एस.ओ. 920 दिनांक 1981-03-21	1981-09-30
187.	सी.एम/एल-0646553 1977-10-19	अतुल बुध प्रारकटन, फेरोक, केरल राज्य	IS: 3084-1975	एस.ओ. 921 निधि 1981-03-21	1981-10-31
188.	सी.एम/एल-0647050 1977-10-19	सुर इन्सुल एंड स्टैमिंग वर्क्स प्रा. लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता-710014	IS: 953-1976	एस.ओ. 921 निधि 1981-03-21	1981-10-31
189.	सी.एम/एल-0651142 1977-10-31	—यबोपरि—	IS: 934-1976	एस.ओ. 921, 1981-03-21	1981-10-31
190.	सी.एम/एल-0652245 1977-11-07	सुवर्णन प्लास्टिक्स इंडस्ट्रीज, जिला डिब्रुगढ़, असम	IS: 1659-1969	एस.ओ. 1223 1981-04-18	1981-11-15
191.	सी.एम/एल-0652750 1977-11-09	बैनर्जी इंजीनियरी वर्क्स, कलकत्ता-17	IS: 3564-1975	एस.ओ. 1223 1981-04-18	1983-11-15

1	2	3	4	5	6	55
192.	सीएम/एन-0654350 1977-11-23	सुर इन्वेस्ट एंड स्टीमिंग यक्स प्रा. लि., कलकत्ता-7000014	IS: 2878-1976	एस.ओ. 1223 तिथि 1981-04-18	1981-11-30	
193.	सीएम/एन-0655857 1977-11-24	खटाऊ अनुर लि., बम्बई-400066	IS: 2834-1964	एस.ओ. 1223 तिथि 1981-04-18	1981-11-30	
194.	सीएम/एन-0656859 1977-12-05	पार्वीजुट फेब्रिकेटर्स बिबार्ई डा. घर-786171 जिला डिब्रुगढ़ (असम)	IS: 7406(भाग-1) 1974	एस.ओ. 1222 तिथि 1981-04-18	1981-11-30	
195.	सीएम/एन-0658257 1977-12-20	समिला फूड प्राइवेट्स लिमिटेड, बम्बई-400079	IS: 10-11-1968	एस.ओ. 1222 तिथि 1981-04-18	1981-12-15	
196.	सीएम/एन-0664353 1978-01-06	मेट्रो पेंट इंड. मई दिल्ली-110027	IS: 5410-1969	एस.ओ. 1615 तिथि 1981-05-30	1981-12-31	
197.	सीएम/एन-0668260 1978-01-24	नपकरचंद्र जूट मिल्स लिमिटेड, जिला-24 परगना (प. बंगाल)	IS: 2566-1965	एस.ओ. 1615 तिथि 1981-05-30	1982-01-15	
198.	सीएम/एन-0713037 1978-07-26	इंडस्ट्रियल फाउंडर्स एंड इंजीनियर्स, बापे (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 774-1971	एस.ओ. 2176 तिथि 1981-08-15	1981-11-30	
199.	सीएम/एन-0715950 1978-08-14	ए.पी. इंडस्ट्रीज, बम्बई-400063	IS: 1795-1974	एस.ओ. 2180 1981-08-15	1981-09-30	
200.	सीएम/एन-0716043 1978-08-16	एशियन बायर रोपस प्रा. लि., जिला मेडक (आ.प्र.)	IS: 1856-1977	एस.ओ. 2180 तिथि 1981-08-15	1981-08-31	
201.	सीएम/एन-0716952 1978-08-17	—अज्ञात—	IS: 2266-1977 IS: 2365-1977 IS: 2581-1977	एस.ओ. 2180 तिथि 1981-08-15	1981-08-31	
202.	सीएम/एन-0721036 1978-09-11	स्पार्टन इलेक्ट्रिकल्स, बम्बई-400013 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 7538-1975	एस.ओ. 2215 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-11-15	
203.	सीएम/एन-072244 1978-09-22	श्री नारायणी पाइप मैनु. कं. कलकत्ता-700002	IS: 4983-1972	एस.ओ. 2215 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-09-30	
204.	सीएम/एन-0727048 1978-10-12	कमना कास्टिंग एंड इंजीनियरी वर्क्स, हावड़ा	IS: 2906-1969	एस.ओ. 2218 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-10-15	
205.	सीएम/एन-0727250 1978-10-12	फायर कुल प्रा. लि., मद्रास-600001	IS: 934-1976	एस.ओ. 2218 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-10-15	
206.	सीएम/एन-0727654 1978-10-17	जेम्स हुटन एंड कं., एरोर, जिला एर्लरपेय	IS: 10 (भाग 4) 1976	एस.ओ. 2218 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-09-30	
207.	सीएम/एन-0729456 1978-10-30	आटो इगनिशन प्रा. लि., करीवामाद-121001	IS: 5977-1971	एस.ओ. 2218 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-10-31	
208.	सीएम/एन-0730340 1978-10-30	जे.के.डि. एंड संस कलकत्ता-700001 (प. बं.)	IS: 7577-1975	एस.ओ. 2218 1981-08-22	1981-11-15	
209.	सीएम/एन-0733348 1978-11-08	पी.बी.एम. इंडस्ट्रीज, हास्पेट-843201 (कर्नाटक)	IS: 7121-1975	एस.ओ. 2218 तिथि 1981-08-22	1981-11-15	
210.	सीएम/एन-0734348 1978-11-15	हियान इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ कम्प्यूटिंग, विजयवाड़ा-520007 जिला-कृष्णा (आ.प्र.)	IS: 2567-1978	एस.ओ. 2270 1981-08-29	1981-11-15	
211.	सीएम/एन-0735350 1978-11-21	श्री बायर रोप मैनु. कम्पनी मंजु, बम्बई-400048 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS: 2266-1977	एस.ओ. 2270 तिथि 1981-08-29	1981-11-30	
212.	सीएम/एन-0736553 1978-11-24	सिध्द इंडस्ट्रियल कार्पो. आगरा -282004	IS: 1601-1960	एस.ओ. 2270 1981-08-29	1981-11-30	
213.	सीएम/एन-0737758 1978-11-28	माइक्रोवेव इंडिया. कलकत्ता-700053	IS: 8263-1976	एस.ओ. 2270 तिथि 1981-08-29	1981-11-30	

1	2	3	4	5	6
214.	सीएम/एल-0738659 1978-12-04	हिन्दुस्तान ब्राउन बावेरी लिमिटेड, फरीदाबाद-121001	IS : 325-1978	एस.ओ. 2270 1981-08-29	1981-11-30
215.	सीएम/एल-0746658 1979-01-10	याणि निर्दिग क., तिरुपुर-638602	IS : 4964-1980	एस.ओ. 2277 1981-08-29	1981-11-15
216.	सीएम/एल-0799275 1979-09-11	भास्कर एगो केमिकल्स एंड काटन इंडस्ट्रीज, गुन्दूर-522005 (आ.प्र.)	IS : 565-1975	एस.ओ. 1772 1982-05-15	1981-09-15
217.	सीएम/एल-0799679 1979-09-13	यमुना उद्योग, यमुना नगर-135001	IS : 10 (भाग-3) 1974	एस.ओ. 1772 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-09-30
218.	सीएम/एल-0799780 1979-09-13	सोमाना केरो एलायज लिमिटेड, जिला कल्याणो नाडिया (प.ब.)	IS : 6914-1978	एस.ओ. 1772 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-09-15
219.	सीएम/एल-0799881 1979-09-13	-यथोपरि-	IS : 6915-1978	एस.ओ. 1172 तिथि 1982-05-15	1982-09-15
220.	सीएम/एल-0800436 1979-09-17	त्रिवेणी स्टॉल प्रा.लि., अमनालपुर, मद्रास-600098	IS : 226-1975	एस.ओ. 1172 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-09-30
221.	सीएम/एल-0801640 1979-09-21	आ. भास्कर एगो केमिकल एंड काटन इंडस्ट्रीज, गुन्दूर-522006 (आ.प्र.)	IS : 2587-1978	एस.ओ. 1772 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-09-30
222.	सीएम/एल-0801943 1979-09-24	धनलक्ष्मी केमिकल्स, पानीपत-632402 (त.ना.)	IS : 261-1966	एस.ओ. 1772 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-09-30
223.	सीएम/एल-0818657 1979-11-30	गीतम इलेक्ट्रिकल मॉटेर्स प्रा. लि., नई दिल्ली	IS : 7538-1975	एस.ओ. 1832 तिथि 1982-05-22	1981-12-15
224.	सीएम/एल-0824349 1979-12-24	गंगेज मैन्युफैक्चरिंग क. लि., जिला हुगली (प.ब.)	IS : 1943-1964	एस.ओ. 2320 तिथि 1982-07-03	1981-11-30
225.	सीएम/एल-0824450 1979-12-24	गंगेज मैन्युफैक्चरिंग क. लि., बासिमेरिया	IS : 2874-1964 IS : 3761-1966	एस.ओ. 2320 तिथि 1982-07-03	1981-11-30
226.	सीएम/एल-0826454 1979-12-27	हवाबैन ट्रेडर्स, मद्रास-625001 (त.ना.)	IS : 4956-1977	एस.ओ. 2320 1982-07-03	1981-12-31
227.	सीएम/एल-0829864 1980-01-10	एरपायर जूट क. लि., तालपुकर	IS : 2874-1964	एस.ओ. 3104 तिथि 1982-09-04	1981-11-30
228.	सीएम/एल-0896273 1980-09-03	गोयज एगो इंड., त्रिवेणी-695020	IS : 1970 (भाग-1) 1947	एस.ओ. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-09-15
229.	सीएम/एल-0896677 1980-09-11	असम उद्योग कम्पनी, दिवरगढ़ (असम)	IS : 226-1975	एस.ओ. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-09-15
230.	सीएम/एल-0897275 1980-09-11	श्री प्रबिका मेटल वर्क्स, हावड़ा-711204	IS : 226-1975	एस.ओ. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-09-15
231.	सीएम/एल-0897276 1980-09-11	-यथोपरि-	IS : 1786-1966	एस.ओ. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-09-15
232.	सीएम/एल-0897578 1980-09-11	जुपिटर बर्मिंघमर्स, विजयवाड़ा-520004 (आ.प्र.)	IS : 3055 (भाग-1) 1977	एस.ओ. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-09-30
233.	सीएम/एल-0799380 1980-09-16	असमन होजरी मिक्स, तिरुपुर-638602	IS : 4964-1980	एस.ओ. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-12-15
234.	सीएम/एल-0805044 1979-10-16	श्री भास्कर एगो केमिकल एंड काटन इंडस्ट्रीज, गुन्दूर-522005 (आ.प्र.)	IS : 633-1975	एस.ओ. 1771 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-10-31
235.	सीएम/एल-0708856 1979-10-19	सेवन हिल्स एगो केमिकल्स, जिला गुन्दूर (आ.प्र.)	IS : 564-1975	एस.ओ. 1771 तिथि 1972-05-15	1981-10-31
236.	सीएम/एल-0809151 1979-10-29	प्रताप स्टील रोडिंग मिक्स (प्रा.) लि., बल्लभगढ़ (हरियाणा)	IS : 8500-1977	एस.ओ. 1771 तिथि 1972-05-15	1981-11-15
237.	सीएम/एल-0710439 1979-10-29	लैबोरेटरी एंड इंडस्ट्रियल केमिकल्स, मद्रास-600029 (त.ना.)	IS : 895-1975	एस.ओ. 1771 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-11-15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
238.	सी एम/एल-0811340 1979-10-30	भगवन् राम लैटेक्स इंडस्ट्रीज, जिला त्रिवेन्द्रम (केरल)	IS : 4148—1967	एस. प्रो. 1771 तिथि 1982-05-15	1981-11-15
239.	सी एम/एल-0812241 1979-11-07	सेवन हिल्स एग्री केमिकल्स, जिसा मुन्दूर (आ. प्र.)	IS : 561—1978	एस. प्रो. 1832 तिथि 1982-05-22	1981-11-15
240.	सी एम/एल-0812847 1979-11-12	एग्री केमिकल्स ग्रोफ इंडिया सतपुर, नासिक-422007 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 562—1978	एस. प्रो. 1832 तिथि 1982-05-22	1981-11-15
241.	सी एम/एल-0712948 1979-11-12	—यथापरि—	IS : 561—1978	एस. प्रो. 1832 तिथि 1982-05-22	1981-11-15
242.	सी एम/एल-0815449 1979-11-21	पी. आर. ट्रेडर्स, हाबड़ा-711101	IS : 780—1969	एस. प्रो. 1832 तिथि 1982-05-22	1981-11-30
243.	सी एम/एल-0816552 1979-11-26	स्कोडा (इंडिया) प्रा. लि., (इंजी. डिजाइन) अर्जोवम-631002 जिला उत्तर आर्कोट (त. ना.)	IS : 7593 (भाग-1) —1975	एस. प्रो. 1832 तिथि 1982-05-22	1981-11-30
244.	सी एम/एल-0817554 1979-11-29	न्यू आविष्कार, गाजियाबाद-201001 (उ. प्र.)	IS : 4654—1974	एस. प्रो. 1832 तिथि 1982-05-32	1981-12-15
245.	सी एम/एल-0818556, 1979-11-30	गोयल इंडस्ट्रियल कॉर्पोरेशन, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा)	IS : 2202 (भाग-1) 1973	एस. प्रो. 1832 तिथि 1982-05-22	1981-12-15
246.	सी एम/एल-0900945, 1980-09-25	इयालकरजी गम्भीर सटर प्रा. लि.,, इयालकरजी (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 6750—1972	एस. प्रो. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-09-30
247.	सी एम/एल-0901341, 1980-09-26	ब्राइट ब्रादर्स लि., 24 परगना (प. ब.)	IS : 398 (भाग-2) 1976	एस. प्रो. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-10-15
248.	सी एम/एल-0902124, 1980-09-30	अरावली केमिकल लैबोरेटरीज, जयपुर-302013 (राजस्थान)	IS : 1061—1975	एस. प्रो. 6414 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-10-15
249.	सी एम/एल-0903244, 1980-09-30	फोनिक्स प्रायव्. लि., (इंडिया) प्रा. लि. कानपुर फैंट-208004 (उ. प्र.)	IS : 493—1958	एस. प्रो. 4614 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-10-15
250.	सी एम/एल-0908355, 1980-10-27	द भारत स्टील रोजिंग मिल्स, सेलम-636 002 (तमिलनाडु),	IS : 1977—1975	एस. प्रो. 4613 तिथि 1983-12-24	1981-11-15
251.	सी एम/एल-0913853, 1980-11-20	ययालकर पेस्टीसाइड्स प्रा. लि., गानपुर (महाराष्ट्र),	IS : 3903—1975	एस. प्रो. 644 तिथि 1984-03-03	1981-11-30
252.	सी एम/एल-0915655, 1980-11-20	साउथन इंडीयन री इंडस्ट्रीज, कोयंबटूर-641037 (त. ना.),	IS : 6595—1972	एस. प्रो. 644 तिथि 1984-03-03	1981-11-30
253.	सी एम/एल-0919158, 1980-11-28	श्री बास्की पेस्टीसाइड्स, सेलम-636012 (तमिलनाडु),	IS : 633—1975	एस. प्रो. 644 तिथि 1984-03-03	1981-12-15
254.	सी एम/एल-0919259, 1980-11-28	—यथापरि—	IS : 565—1975	एस. प्रो. 644 तिथि 1984-03-03	1981-12-15

S. O. 3973:—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of Regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulation, 1955, as amended from time to time, it is, hereby, notified that the Certification Marks Licences, details of which are mentioned in the following Schedule, have lapsed or their renewals deferred, effective from the dates shown in Column 6 :

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. (CM/L. . .)	Licensee	IS : No.	S.O. No. & Date of the Gazette Notifying Grant of licence	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
LICENCES LAPSED					
1.	CM/L-0013211 1959-06-24	E.I.D. Parry (India) Ltd., Madras-600001.	IS : 564—1975	—	Renewal was deferred after 1981-05-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
2.	CM/L-0023214 1960-10-17	Assam Plywood Products, P.O. Jeypore, Distt. Lakhimpur, (Assam).	IS : 10(Part-II). 1976	S.O. 2659 dated 1960-11-05	Renewal was deferred after 1980-01-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
3.	CM/L-0097546 1964-11-30	Devidayal Aluminium Industries Pvt. Ltd., Ghaziabad (U.P.)	IS : 1660 (Part I)—1967 IS : 1660 (Part II)—1972 IS : 1660 (Part III)—1972 IS : 1660 (Part IV)—1977	S.O. 3539 dated 1963-12-21	Lapsed after 1981-10-15
4.	CM/L-0137229 1966-12-26	Imperial Stores & Agency Co., Calcutta-700006	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	S.O. 243 dated 1967-01-21	Lapsed after 1980-12-31
5.	CM/L-0165133 1968-03-11	Hind Ceramic Limited, Calcutta-700001	IS : 651—1971	S.O. 1470 dated 1968-04-27	Renewal was deferred after 1979-03-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
6.	CM/L-0195950 1969-04-30	Assam Timber Treating Works, P. O. Margherita, Distt. Lakhimpur, (Assam)	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976	S.O. 2238 dated 1969-06-07	Renewal was deferred after 1981-01-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
7.	CM/L-0204319 1969-08-06	Keen Pesticides (Pvt) Limited, Medical P. O. (Via) Perumbevoor, Kerala	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 3930 dated 1969-09-27	Lapsed after 1981-10-15
8.	CM/L-0209632 1969-09-30	Travancore Trades & Agencies, Kattayam-686001	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	S.O. 4310 dated 1969-10-25	Renewal was deferred after 1981-05-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
9.	CM/L-0221723 1970-01-22	Banik Sangh (Pvt) Limited, Calcutta-700006	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	S.O. 771 dated 1970-02-28	Lapsed after 1980-08-31
10.	CM/L-0228434 1970-03-20	Assam Railways & Trading Co. Ltd., P.O. Margherita, Lakhimpur, Dibrugarh (Upper Assam)	IS : 10 (Part III)—1974	S.O. 1508 dated 1970-04-25	Renewal was deferred after 1979-03-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
11.	CM/L-036635 1970-07-13	Coastal Engg. Co., Cochin-682005	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	S.O. 2109 dated 1971-05-29	Renewal was deferred after 1981-06-1; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
12.	CM/L-039136 1970-08-18	Shah Medical & Surgical Co. Ltd., Baroda-390001	IS : 3317—1965	S.O. 57 dated 1971-01-02	Renewal was deferred after 1979-08-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
13.	CM/L-0264539 1971-03-30	Sibsagar Forest Products, Limited, Distt. Sibsaagar (Assam) P.O. Suftry-785689	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976	S.O. 2405 dated 1971-06-19	Renewal was deferred after 1979-11-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
14.	CM/L-0266644 1971-04-27	Bangalore Pesticides Limited, Bangalore	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 3741 dated 1971-10-09	Lapsed after 1981-10-31
15.	CM/L-0266846 1971-04-22	-do-	IS : 633—1975	S.O. 3741 dated 1971-10-09	Lapsed after 1981-10-31
16.	CM/L-0269650 1971-06-07	Bharat Cement Waterproofing Research Co., Calcutta-700033	IS : 2645—1975	S.O. 3594 dated 1971-10-02	Renewal was deferred after 1978-01-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
17. CM/L-0 70231 1971-06-15	Jolly Steel Industries Pvt. Limited, Poona-411001	IS : 1786—1979	S.O. 3594 dated 1971-10-02	Renewal was deferred after 1980-06-30 ; the licence now lapsed after that date	
18. CM/L-0 74239 1971-08-18	Steel Authority of India Limited, Kanpur	IS : 1786—1979	S.O. 5031 dated 1971-11-06	Lapsed after 1980-08-15	
19. CM/L-076243 1971-09-13	Jolly Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd., Poona	IS : 226—1975	S.O. 2403 dated 1972-09-02	Renewal was deferred after 1980-06-30; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
20. CM/L-0301822 1972-03-30	Cable Corporation of India Limited, Bombay-400066	IS : 694—1977	S.O. 887 dated 1973-03-24	Lapsed after 1981-10-31	
21. CM/L-0345741 1973-06-28	Revived Saranjam Karayalaya, Bhubaneswar-1	IS : 1515—1969	S.O. 1037 dated 1975-04-05	Lapsed after 1981-06-30	
22. CM/L-0370134 1974-02-06	Kilpest Pvt Ltd. Bhopal 462023 (MP)	IS : 2567—1978	S.O. 2082 dated 1975-07-05	Renewal was deferred after 1979-10-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
23. CM/L-0408840 1974-12-12	Indian National Diesel Engine Co. Ltd., Calcutta-700043	IS : 1601—1980	S.O. 2286 dated 1976-07-03	Lapsed after 1981-12-15	
24. CM/L-0419247 1975-04-08	Utkal Pesticides & Chemicals, Jagannathpur, Distt. Ganjam (Orissa)	IS : 2567—1978	S.O. 3550 dated 1976-10-09	Lapsed after 1981-04-15	
25. CM/L-0419343 1975-04-08	Utkal Pesticides & Chemicals, Jagannathpur, Distt. Ganjam (Orissa)	IS : 633—1975	S.O. 3550 dated 1976-10-09	Renewal was deferred after 1981-04-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
26. CM/L-0456851 1975-08-11	Steel (India) Pvt. Ltd. Aurangabad-431001	IS : 6003—1970	S.O. 428 dated 1977-02-05	Renewal was deferred after 1980-06-30; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
27. CM/L-0462442 1975-09-12	Utkal Pesticides & Chemicals, Jagannathpur, Distt. Ganjam (Orissa)	IS : 5279—1969	S.O. 832 dated 1977-03-19	Lapsed after 1981-09-15	
28. CM/L-0475151 1975-10-27	Pesticides & Brewers Limited, Thane-400607 (Maharashtra)	IS : 2567—1978	S.O. 1148 dated 1977-04-16	Renewal was deferred after 1980-07-30; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
29. CM/L-0475956 1975-10-9	Southern Insecticides & Fertilizers, Madras-600096 (Tamil Nadu)	IS : 1307—1973	S.O. 1148 dated 1977-04-16	Lapsed after 1981-10-31	
30. CM/L-0479762 1975-11-24	Swastik Industries, Hyderabad	IS : 916—1975	S.O. 1147 dated 1977-04-16	Lapsed after 1981-10-31	
31. CM/L-0481347 1975-11-24	Osnar Chemicals Pvt Limited, P.O. Turbhe, Vill. Pawan, Distt. Thana (Maharashtra)	IS : 7193—1974	S.O. 1147 dated 1977-04-16	Renewal was deferred after 1978-12-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
32. CM/L-0485858 1975-12-04	Patranobis & Co. Calcutta- 700013	IS:7406-1974	S.O. 3083 dated 1977-10-08	Renewal was deferred after 1980-11-30; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
33. CM/L-0193655 1976-01-01	Sonawala Industries Ltd. Bombay -400002	IS:266-1977	S.O. 1312 dated 1977-05-07	Lapsed after 1980-12-31	
34. CM/L-0493857 1976-01-06	Instruments Orthopedics, Thana (Maharashtra)	IS:5395-1969 IS:5846-1970	S.O. 1312 dated 1977-05-07	Renewal was deferred after 1980-01-15 ; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
35. CM/L-0496055 1976-01-15	Nagaland Forest Products Limited, P.O. Tijit, Via Sonary Distt. Mon (Naga- land)	IS:10(Part II)- 1976	S.O. 1312 dated 1977-05-07	Lapsed after 1981-03-31	
36. CM/L-0502933 1976-02-26	Tarapur Chemicals & Pesti- cides, Boisar (M.S.)- 401501	IS:562-1978	S.O. 3441 dated 1978-12-02	Lapsed after 1981-02-29	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
37. CM/L-0509846 1976-03-31	Mansingka Industries Limited Bombay -400020 (Maharashtra)	IS:916-1975	S.O. 12 dated 1979-01-06	Lapsed after 1981-02-28	
38. CM/L-0511530 1976-04-01	Star rubber products, Poona - 411018	IS:3976-1975	S.O. 314 dated 1979-01-27	Renewal was deferred after 1981-06-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
39. CM/L-0513635 1976-04-19	Special Steel Limited, Bombay- 400066	IS:2141-1968	S.O. 314 dated 1979-01-27	Renewal was deferred after 1980-04-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
40. CM/L-0516237 1976-04-29	Rukmani Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd. Bangalore-560027	IS:1977-1975	S.O. 314 dated 1979-01-27	Lapsed after 1981-10-31	
41. CM/L-0529650 1976-06-14	National Plywood Industries. Pvt Ltd. Tinsukaia (Assam)	IS:219(Part I)- 1973 and IS:2202 (Part I)- 1973	S.O. 1274 dated 1979-04-21	Renewal was deferred after 1981-06-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
42. CM/L-0532235 1976-06-29	Krishi Rasayan, National High- way No. 5, P.O. Ranital, Dist Balastore (Orissa)	IS:633-1975	S.O. 1274 dated 1979-04-21	Lapsed after 1981-06-30	
43. CM/L-0545446 1976-08-30	Neptune Electrical Inds Bom- bay- 400013.	IS:2148-1968	S.O. 3548 dated 1979-10-20	Renewal was deferred after 1980-10-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
44. CM/L-0548149 1976-09-08	Plyboards India, Chotaipjan, Makum P.O. Distt. Dibrugarh (Assam)	IS:10(Part II)—1976	S.O. 3549 dated 1979-01-20	Renewal was deferred after 1980-09-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
45. CM/L-0550641 1976-09-20	Alliance Mills Lessees Pvt Ltd. Jagadal-743125, 24 Parganas (W.B.)	IS:7407—1974	S.O. 3549 dated 1979-10-20	Renewal as deferred after 1981-09-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
46. CM/L-0554548 1976-10-04	Shrinivan Steel Ltd., P. O. Bijoli Jhansi-284001 (U.P.)	IS:6914-1978	S.O. 3549 dated 1979-10-20	Lapsed after 1981-07-31	
47. CM/L-0554649 1976-10-04	Ajay Pesticides, Bahraich U.P.	IS:561—1978	S.O. 3550 dated 1979-10-20	Lapsed after 1981-09-30	
48. CM/L-0556956 1976-10-12	NGEF Ltd. Bangalore-560038	IS:6596-1972 & IS:7538-1975	S.O. 3550 dated 1979-11-20	Lapsed after 1981-01-15	
49. CM/L-0567153 1976-11-30	SMP Pvt Ltd. Bombay-400060 (Maharashtra)	IS:7122-1973	S.O. 3761 dated 1979-11-17	Lapsed after 1980-12-15	
50. CM/L-0572853 1976-12-24	Vishal Engineering Bhubanesh- war-751000 & Distt. Puri (Orissa)	IS:2089-1972	S.O. 3762 dated 1979-11-17	Lapsed after 1980-12-31	
51. CM/L-0578764 1977-01-11	Sonarie Saw & Plywood Sonarie P. O. Distt Sibsagar (Assam)	IS:10(Part II)—1976	S.O. 420 dated 1980-02-23	Lapsed after 1981-01-15	
52. CM/L-0586258 1977-02-03	Shree Ganeshi Steel Rolling Mills, Madras-600019	IS:226-1975	S.O. 731 dated 1980-03-22	Renewal was deferred after 1981-01-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
53. CM/L-0586864 1977-02-03	Sun Steel Industries, Howrah- 711105	IS:1977-1975	S.O. 731 dated 1980-03-22	Renewal was deferred after 1981-02-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
54. CM/L-0588969 1977-02-28	Government Milk Scheme, (Dairy Development Depart- ment) Govt of Maharashtra Miraj-416410, Distt, Sangli, Maharashtra.	IS:1165-1975	S.O. 731 dated 1980-03-22	Renewal was deferred after 1980-02-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
55. CM/L-0590855 1977-02-28	Victor (India), Phukan Ali, P.O. Jorhat, Distt. Sibsagar (Assam)	IS:10 (Part IV)—1976	S.O. 731 dated 1980-03-22	Renewal was deferred after 1981-02-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
56. CM/L-0591150 1977-02-28	Krishi Discs Pvt Limited, Barcilly (UP)	IS:4366 (Part I)—1972	S.O. 731 dated 1980-03-22	Renewal was deferred after 1981-02-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
57. CM/L-591756 1977-02-28	Krishna electrical Industries, New Delhi-110005	IS:694-1977	S.O. 731 dated 1980-03-22	Lapsed after 1981-11-15	
58. CM/L-0598973 1977-03-24	Southern Steelment & Alloys Ltd., Bangalore-560048	IS:961—1975	S.O. 787 dated 1980-03-29	Renewal was deferred after 1981-03-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
59. CM/L-0599469 1977-03-24	Southern Stulment & Alloys Ltd. Bangdore- 560048	IS:443—1967	S.O. 787 dated 1980-03-29	Renewal was deferred after 1981-03-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
60. CM/L-0609446 1977-05-13	Marathwada Insecticides & Pesticides, Thane, Aurangabad-824101 (M.S.)	IS:561—1978	S.O. 783 dated 1981-01-24	Renewal was deferred after 1980-05-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
61. CM/L-0609951 1977-05-13	Sureka Chemicals, Gorakhpur-273004	IS:561—1978	S.O. 283 dated 1981-01-24	Renewal was deferred after 1981-04-30; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
62. CM/L-0612031 1977-05-23	Swastika Metal Works, Jagadhri (Haryana)	IS:1972—1961	S.O. 283 dated 1981-02-41	Lapsed after 1981-05-15	
63. CM/L-0630841 1977-07-30	United Wire Ropes Limited, Thana-400606 (Maharashtra)	IS:3623—1966	S.O. 754 dated 1981-03-07	Lapsed after 1981-09-15	
64. CM/L-0634950 1977-08-16	Jadav Leather Works, Sangli-416 416 (Maharashtra)	IS:1989 (Part I)—1978 IS:1989 (Part II)—1978	S.O. 755 dated 1981-03-07	Renewal was deferred after 1978-12-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
65. CM/L-0636752 1977-08-23	Krishi Rasayan, National Highway No. 5, P.O. Ranital-756111 Distt. Balasore (Orissa)	IS:564—1975	S.O. 755 dated 1981-03-07	Renewal was deferred after 1981-08-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
66. CM/L-0637653 1977-08-26	Anchor Industries, Bombay-400064	IS:3854—1966	S.O. 755 dated 1981-03-07	Lapsed after 1980-08-31	
67. CM/L-0638352 1977-08-31	Leather Corporation of Orissa Ltd., Cuttack-753003 (Orissa)	IS:583—1969	S.O. 755 dated 1981-03-07	Renewal was deferred after 1978-08-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
68. CM/L-0638453 1977-08-31	-do-	IS:578—1971	S.O. 755 dated 1981-03-07	Renewal was deferred after 1979-11-30; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
69. CM/L-0642030 1977-09-21	M.P.R. Engg. Works Batala (Punjab)	IS:1729—1964	S.O. 920 dated 1981-03-21	Lapsed after 1981-09-30	
70. CM/L-0647756 1977-10-24	Goel Steel Industries, Howrah	IS:1977—1975	S.O. 921 dated 1981-03-21	Renewal was deferred after 1981-02-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
71. CM/L-0648456 1977-10-28	Bharat Industries, Muzaffarpur-842001 (Bihar)	IS:6595—1972	S.O. 921 dated 1981-03-21	Lapsed after 1979-10-15	
72. CM/L-0649761 1977-10-31	Assam Valley Plywood (Pvt) Ltd., Calcutta-700017	IS:2202 (Part I) -1973	S.O. 921 dated 1981-03-21	Renewal was deferred after 1981-10-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
73. CM/L-0650140 1977-10-31	Utkal Pesticides & Chemicals, Jagannathram, Distt. Ganjam (Orissa)	IS:4323—1967	S.O. 921 dated 1981-03-21	Renewal was deferred after 1973-10-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
74. CM/L-0667158 1978-01-16	S.B. Suvarna & Co., Bangalore-560044 (Karnataka)	IS:6248—1971	S.O. 1615 dated 1981-05-30	Renewal was deferred after 1981-01-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
75. CM/L-0683559 1978-03-07	Pactil Electronics Pvt. Ltd., Kamothe, Panvel, Distt. Kolaba (Maharashtra)	IS:325—1978	S.O. 1664 dated 1981-06-06	Renewal was deferred after 1981-03-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
76. CM/L-0686161 1978-03-17	Jai Insecticides Unao	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 1664 dated 1981-06-06	Renewal was deferred after 1981-03-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
77. CM/L-0686464 1976-03-17	Tuffite Plastics Limited, Colmbatore-641004 (T.N.)	IS : 5225—1969	S.O. 1664 dated 1981-06-06	Lapsed after 1981-10-15	
78. CM/L-0702037 1978-05-29	Kamal Industries, Delhi-110 035	IS : 7466—1974	S.O. 2003 dated 1981-07-25	Renewal was deferred after 1981-05-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
79. CM/L-0705442 1978-06-19	Rajendra Electrical Industries Pvt. Ltd., Bombay-400048 (Maharashtra)	IS : 7538—1975	S.O. 2002 dated 1981-07-15	Lapsed after 1981-03-31	
80. CM/L-0705543 1978-06-19	Karnataka Agro Chemicals, Bangalore (Karnataka)	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 2002 dated 1981-07-15	Renewal was deferred after 1981-07-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
81. CM/L-0708145 1978-06-28	Sunder Tin Factory, Rohtak (Haryana)	IS : 916—1975	S.O. 2002 dated 1981-07-15	Lapsed after 1981-08-31	
82. CM/L-0719049 1978-08-31	Kolhapur Auto Works, Kolhapur-416001 (Maharashtra)	IS : 6595—1972	S.O. 2180 dated 1981-08-15	Renewal was deferred after 1981-01-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
83. CM/L-0719352 1976-08-31	Rallis India Ltd. Madras-600058 (TN)	IS : 2861—1964	S.O. 2180 dated 1981-08-15	Lapsed after 1981-09-16	
84. CM/L-0720034 1978-09-11	Super India Match Co. (P) Ltd. Silchar, Cachar (Assam)	IS : 10 (Part III)—1974	S.O. 2215 dated 1980-08-22	Renewal was deferred after 1980-09-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
85. CM/L-0722644 1978-09-18	Industrial Graphites Hyderabad.	IS : 1305—1967	S.O. 2215 dated 1981-08-07	Lapsed after 1981-09-30	
86. CM/L-0724850 1978-10-03	Plastigee Chemical & Plastics Pvt. Ltd. Thane-400 604 (Maharashtra).	IS : 958—1975	S.O. 2218 dated 1981-07-82	Renewal was deferred after 1980-09-30; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
87. CM/L-0727856 1978-10-18	Makewall Pvt. Ltd. Bhubaneshwar-751 010	IS : 261—1966	S.O. 2218 dated 1981-08-22	Renewal was deferred after 1980-10-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date	
88. CM/L-0729961 1978-10-30	Kashmira Ceramic Products Pvt. Ltd. Village Mira-401104 Distt. Thane.	IS : 651—1971	S.O. 2218 dated 1981-08-22	Lapsed after 1981-10-31	
89. CM/L-0731645 1978-11-07	Coromandal Indag Products (Pvt.) Ltd. Madras-600 019 (TN).	IS : 4322—1967	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	Lapsed after 1981-11-15	
90. CM/L-0733851 1978-11-13	Crescent Iron & Steel Corpn. Ltd. Bombay-400063 (Maharashtra).	IS : 325—1978	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	Lapsed after 1980-11-15	
91. CM/L-0736554 1978-11-23	Agrochule Industries India, Thane-400607	IS : 633—1975	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	Lapsed after 1981-11-30	
92. CM/L-0738356 1976-12-04	Barakaso Pvt. Ltd. Bombay-4000 63	IS : 2548—1967	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	Lapsed after 1981-11-30	
93. CM/L-0752754 1979-01-07	Multiplex Agro Inds. Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad-382 330 (Gujarat).	IS : 7122—1973	S.O. 2310 dated 1981-09-05	Lapsed after 1981-07-15	
94. CM/L-0753655 1979-07-16	Ramkrishna Bandhu, Malegaon-423 203 Distt. Nasik (Maharashtra).	IS : 4359—1967	S.O. 2310 dated 1981-09-05	Lapsed after 1981-07-28	
95. CM/L-0754960 1979-07-21	Handy Products, Panvel, New Bombay (Maharashtra)	IS : 1222—1973	S.O. 2210 dated 1981-09-05	Lapsed after 1981-03-31	
96. CM/L-0763658 1979-03-22	Multiplex Agro Indus Pvt. Ltd. Ahmedabad-382330 (Gujarat)	IS : 633—1975	S.O. 2385 dated 1981-10-03	Lapsed after 1981-03-31	

97. CM/L-0768163 1979-03-30	Choudhry Industries, Siliguri Ektiasal, Distt. Darjeeling	IS : 10 (Part III)—1974	S.O. 2585 dated 1981-10-03	Renewal was deferred after 1981-04-15 the licence now stands lapsed after that date
98. CM/L-0786872 1979-07-19	Madhu Allied Agro Chemical Corpn., Koppuravur-522508 Guntur Distt.	IS : 633—1975	S.O. 3443 dated 1981-12-26	Lapsed after 1981-07-31
99. CM/L-0787167 1979-07-20	J.M. Engg. Works, Howrah	IS : 4310—1967	S.O. 3443 dated 1981-12-26	Lapsed after 1981-07-31
100. CM/L-0789979 1979-08-02	Gem Paints, Amritsar (Punjab)	IS : 427—1965	S.O. 3466 dated 1981-12-26	Lapsed after 1981-08-15
101. CM/L-0792463 1979-08-10	Ranu Foundry, Coimbatore-641037 (Tamil Nadu)	IS : 6595—1972	S.O. 3466 dated 1981-12-26	Renewal was deferred after 1981-08-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
102. CM/L-0793364 1979-08-20	Agro Industrial Chemicals Co., Rudrapur, Distt. Nainital-263153 (UP)	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 3466 dated 1981-12-26	Lapsed after 1981-08-31
103. CM/L-0796269 1979-08-27	Jai Bharat Hardware Co., Panipat.	IS : 280—1978	S.O. 3466 dated 1981-12-26	Lapsed after 1981-08-31
104. CM/L-0800133 1979-09-14	Coromandel Indag Products (P) Ltd., Madras-600019 (TN)	IS : 2568—1968	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	Lapsed after 1981-09-30
105. CM/L-0801444 1979-09-29	Aarti Steels, Village Sherpur Kalan, Ludhiana (Punjab)	IS : 226—1975	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	Lapsed after 1981-01-15
106. CM/L-0809353 1979-10-29	Bangalore Pesticides Limited, Bangalore-562139 (Karnataka)	IS : 2682—1966	S.O. 1771 dated 1982-05-15	Lapsed after 1981-11-15
107. CM/L-0809656 1979-10-29	Beco Engineering Co Ltd., Batala	IS : 1786—1979	S.O. 1771 dated 1982-05-15	Lapsed after 1981-11-15
108. CM/L-0838259 1980-02-20	Technico, Calcutta-700002	IS : 940—1976	S.O. 3445 dated 1982-10-02	Renewal was deferred after 1981-02-28; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
109. CM/L-0846258 1980-03-11	Nandi Re-rolling Mills Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore-560 007	IS : 226—1975	S.O. 4452 dated 1983-12-10	Renewal was deferred after 1981-03-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
110. CM/L-0851049 1980-03-25	North Bengal Plywood Industries, P.O. Ektiasal (Siliguri)	IS : 10 (Part III)—1974	S.O. 4452 dated 1983-12-10	Renewal was deferred after 1981-03-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
111. CM/L-0859267 1980-03-21	Ravi Paints & Chemical Ltd., Madras-600 001	IS : 5410—1969	S.O. 4452 dated 1983-12-10	Renewal was deferred after 1981-04-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
112. CM/L-0868369 1980-05-09	Premier Timber & Plywood Products, Distt. Jalpaiguri	IS : 10 (Part III)—1974	S.O. 4460 dated 1983-12-10	Renewal was deferred after 1981-05-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
113. CM/L-0869573 1980-05-19	Wilson Chemicals, Madras	IS : 266—1977	S.O. 4460 dated 1983-12-10	Lapsed after 1981-05-31
114. CM/L-0869977 1980-05-20	-do-	IS : 264—1976	S.O. 4460 dated 1983-12-10	Lapsed after 1981-05-31
115. CM/L-0882666 1980-07-23	Krishna Steel Inds., Thane	IS : 1977—1975	S.O. 4533 dated 1983-12-17	Renewal was deferred after 1981-07-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
116. CM/L-0885874 1980-07-31	Modern Chemicals, P.O. Ripponpet-577 426 Distt. Shimoga (Karnataka)	IS : 2568—1978	S.O. 4533 dated 1983-12-17	Renewal was deferred after 1981-08-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date
117. CM/L-0886674 1980-07-31	Modern Chemicals, P.O. Ripponpet-577 624 Distt. Shimoga (Karnataka)	IS : 7121—1973	S.O. 4533 dated 1983-12-17	Renewal was deferred after 1981-08-15; the licence now stands lapsed after that date

1	2	3	4	5	6
118. CM/L-0886775 1980-07-31	Moorut Agro-chemical Industries, Meerut.	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 4533 dated 1983-12-17	Lapsed after 1981-07-31	
119. CM/L-0889276 1980-08-18	Jivan Foods, Hyderabad.	IS : 1011—1968	S.O. 4531 dated 1983-12-17	Lapsed after 1981-08-31	
120. CM/L-0890968 1980-08-20	Dee Gee Steel Rolling & Drawing Mills, Lucknow.	IS : 1977—1975	S.O. 4531 dated 1983-12-17	Lapsed after 1981-08-31	
121. CM/L-0891263 1980-08-21	Urvi Investments Ltd. (Pirmal Organic Chemical Division), Thane	IS : 1827—1961	S.O. 4531 dated 1983-12-17	Lapsed after 1981-08-31	
122. CM/L-0894370 1980-08-29	Modern Chemicals, P.O. Ripponpet-577426 Distt. Shimoga (Karnataka)	IS : 1507—1977	S.O. 4531 dated 1983-12-17	Lapsed after 1981-09-15	
123. CM/L-0900541 1980-09-24	Sindichem Limited, Distt. Wardha	IS : 7121—1973	S.O. 4613 dated 1983-12-24	Lapsed after 1981-09-30	
124. CM/L-0903850 1980-10-07	Sardar Rolling Mills, Mandsaur	IS : 226—1975	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	Lapsed after 1981-10-15	
125. CM/L-0904448 1980-10-10	Tarapur Chemicals & Pesticides, Boisar-401501 Distt. Thane (Maharashtra)	IS : 565—1975	S.O. 4613 1983-12-24	Lapsed after 1981-10-15	
126. CM/L-0906856 1980-10-14	The Punjab Dairy Development Corpn. Limited, Verka, Distt. Amritsar (Punjab)	IS : 1547—1968	S.O. 4613 dated 1983-12-24	Lapsed after 1981-10-31	
127. CM/L-0907252 1980-10-21	Shree Ganesh Steel Rolling Mills, Madras	IS : 1786—1979	S.O. 4613 dated IS : 12-24	Renewal was deferred after 1981-10-31; the licence now stands lapsed after that date DEFERRED AFTER	
LICENCES DEFERRED					
128. CM/L-0012916 1959-06-23	The Alkali & Chemical Corpn. of India Ltd., Calcutta-700016	IS : 632—1978	—	1981-10-31	
129. CM/L-0018928 1960-04-27	Gautam Electric Motors Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi-110020	IS : 325—1978	S.O. 1187 dated 1960-05-14	1981-10-31	
130. CM/L-0038530 1962-0-14	Assam Saw Mills & Timber Co. Ltd. Calcutta-19	IS : 10(Part II)—1976	S.O. 751 dated 1962-03-17	1981-10-31	
131. CM/L-0071225 1964-06-29	Sanganeria Co. Pvt. Limited, Calcutta-700007	IS : 226—1975	S.O. 2590 dated 1964-08-01	1981-10-31	
132. CM/L-0071326 1964-06-29	-do-	IS : 1977—1975	S.O. 2590 dated 1964-08-01	1981-10-31	
133. CM/L-0084638 1964-11-28	Kanknarrah Co. Ltd. Bhatpara	IS : 2818 (Part II)— 1971 & IS : 3790—1971	S.O. 79 dated 1965-01-02	1981-11-30	
134. CM/L-0086036 1964-11-28	Dalhousie Jute Co. Ltd., Champdany	IS : 2818 (Part II)— 1971 & IS : 3790—1971	S.O. 79 dated 1965-01-02	1981-12-31	
135. CM/L-0094641 1964-11-28	Ganges Manufacturing Co., Distt. Hoogly (W.B.)	IS : 2566—1965 & IS : 3667—1966	S.O. 79 dated 1965-01-02	1981-11-30	
136. CM/L-0114621 1965-09-17	Lillooah Steel & Wires Co. Ltd. Howrah	IS : 226—1975	S.O. 3324 dated 1965-10-23	1981-10-15	
137. CM/L-0114722 1965-09-17	-do-	IS : 1977—1975	S.O. 3324 dated 1965-10-23	1981-10-15	
138. CM/L-0121820 1966-03-02	United Wire Ropes Limited, Thana	IS : 1855—1977 & IS : 1856—1977	S.O. 1263 dated 1966-04-23	1981-09-15	
139. CM/L-0127428 1966-05-31	Sur Iron & Steel Co Pvt Ltd. Belur, Howrah.	IS : 1851—1975	S.O. 1799 dated 1966-06-18	1981-10-15	
140. CM/L-0166236 1968-03-27	Challha Rolling Mills Pvt. Pvt. Ltd., 5 Mission Row, Calcutta-700001	IS : 280—1978	S.O. 1470 dated 1968-04-27	1981-11-30	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
141. CM/L-0176744 1968-08-19	Parkash & Co New Delhi	IS : 703—1977	S.O. 3677 dated 1968-10-19	1981-10-31	
142. CM/L-0181030 1968-10-14	Mohatta & Hackel Limited, Maharashtra	IS : 2266—1977	S.O. 4257 dated 1968-11-30	1981-09-30	
143. CM/L-0191437 1969-02-07	The General Engg. Co. Colmbatore-641011 (Tamil Nadu)	IS : 325—1978	S.O. 1256 dated 1969-04-15	1981-11-15	
144. CM/L-0191639 1969-02-13	B.D. Khaitan & Co., Calcutta-700001	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 1256 dated 1969-04-05	1981-10-31	
145. CM/L-0203822 1969-07-17	Sanfix India Pvt. Limited, Howrah	IS : 744—1971	S.O. 3585 dated 1969-09-06	1981-09-30	
146. CM/L-0275443 1971-08-27	Industrial containers Ltd. Calcutta	IS : 1783—1974	S.O. 5031 dated 1971-11-06	1981-09-15	
147. CM/L-0322325 1972-11-28	Sindichem Limited, Tehsil & Distt. Wardah	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 1700 dated 1973-06-15	1981-11-30	
148. CM/L-0322527 1972-11-28	-do-	IS : 564—1975	S.O. 1700 dated 1973-06-16	1981-11-30	
149. CM/L-0323630 1972-11-30	-do-	IS : 2567—1978	S.O. 1700 dated 1973-06-16	1981-11-30	
150. CM/L-0328135 1973-01-08	Calcutta Containers & Printing Works, Calcutta	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	S.O. 1798 dated 1974-07-20	1981-09-15	
151. CM/L-0395756 1974-09-19	Assam Valley Plywood Pvt. Ltd. Tinsukia (Assam)	IS : 303—1975	S.O. 1762 dated 1976-05-29	1981-09-30	
152. CM/L-0396758 1974-09-25	Lekhapani Veneer & Saw Mills, Assam	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976	S.O. 1762 dated 1976-05-29	1981-10-31	
153. CM/L-0406230 1974-11-25	Metal Engg. & Co., Calcutta-700002	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	S.O. 2022 dated 1976-06-19	1981-11-30	
154. CM/L-0425739 1975-03-07	National Plywood Inds Pvt Ltd. Tinsukia-786125 Assam	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976	--	*1981-11-30	
155. CM/L-0469557 1975-09-29	Gadgets India, Faridabad	IS : 4151—1976	S.O. 832 dated 1977-03-19	1981-10-15	
156. CM/L-0469961 1975-10-15	Titagur Paper Mills Co. Ltd. Titagur	IS : 1848—1971	S.O. 1148 dated 1977-04-16	1981-09-30	
157. CM/L-0470037 1975-10-15	Titagur Paper Mills Co. Ltd., Kankinara	IS : 1848—1971	S.O. 1148 dated 1977-04-16	1981-09-30	
158. CM/L-0471241 1975-10-15	Punalur paper Mills Limited, Punalur, (Kerala State)	IS : 1848—1971	S.O. 1148 dated 1977-04-16	1981-09-30	
159. CM/L-0471746 1975-10-15	Ruchika Cables, Delhi	IS : 694—1977	S.O. 1148 dated 1977-04-16	1981-10-15	
160. CM/L-0478558 1975-10-31	Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. Jaipur-302006 (Rajasthan)	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 1148 dated 1977-04-16	1981-11-15	
161. CM/L-0482953 1975-11-24	B.D. Khaitan & Co. 24 Parganas (W.B.)	IS : 633—1975	S.O. 1147 dated 1977-04-16	1981-11-30	
162. CM/L-0483046 1975-11-24	-do-	IS : 565—1975	S.O. 1147 dated 1977-04-16	1981-11-30	
163. CM/L-0484250 1975-11-26	Singh Alloys & Steels Ltd., Calcutta-700054	IS : 6914—1978	S.O. 1147 dated 1977-04-16	1981-11-30	
164. CM/L-0488763 1975-12-12	Sudhagad Rubber Inds Pvt. Ltd. Distt. Kolaba	IS : 4892—1968	S.O. 3083 dated 1977-10-08	1981-12-15	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
165.	CM/L-0489260 1975-12-12	Shalimar Tar Products (1935) Ltd., Bombay-400078	IS : 7193—1974	S.O. 3083 dated 1977-10-08	1981-09-30
166.	CM/L-0491449 1975-12-19	Dalhousie Jute Co. Ltd., Champdany	IS : 7407 (Parts II & III) 1980	S.O. 3083 dated 1977-10-08	1981-12-31
167.	CM/L-0516035 1976-04-29	Rukmani Steel Inds. Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore	IS : 1786—1979	S.O. 314 dated 1979-01-27	1981-01-31
168.	CM/L-0516136 1976-04-29	-do-	IS : 226—1975	S.O. 314 dated 1979-01-27	1981-01-31
169.	CM/L-0527242 1976-06-04	Sindichem Ltd. Distt. Wardha (Maharashtra)	IS : 633—1975	S.O. 1274 dated 1979-04-21	1981-11-30
170.	CM/L-0529347 1976-06-14	Eastern Traders, New Delhi-110028	IS : 417 (Part I)—1974 IS : 417 (Part II)—1974 IS : 417 (Part III)—1974	S.O. 1274 dated 1979-04-21	1981-11-30
171.	CM/L-0538954 1976-08-02	Hindustan Steel Ltd. Hyderabad	IS : 1786—1966	S.O. 3548 dated 1979-10-20	1981-07-31
172.	CM/L-0550540 1976-09-20	The National Insulated Cable Co. of India Limited, Calcutta	IS : 1026—1966	S.O. 3549 dated 1979-10-20	1981-09-15
173.	CM/L-0550944 1976-09-20	Malhotra & Hackel Limited, Bombay-400001 (Maharashtra)	IS : 398 (Part -II)—1976	S.O. 3594 dated 1979-10-20	1981-09-30
174.	CM/L-0552443 1976-09-24	Mambad Rubber Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Malappuram Distt. (Kerala)	IS : 4588—1977	S.O. 3549 dated 1979-10-20	1981-09-30
175.	CM/L-0553647 1976-09-24	B.D. Khaitan & Co Calcutta	IS : 1307—1973	S.O. 3549 dated 1979-10-20	1981-09-15
176.	CM/L-0556249 1976-10-11	Jayalakshmi Chemicals & Pulvers, Kurnool Distt. (AP)	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 3550 dated 1979-10-20	1981-10-15
177.	CM/L-0558758 1976-10-25	Electro steel castings Ltd., Distt. 24 Parganas (West Bengal)	IS : 1536—1976	S.O. 3550 dated 1979-10-20	1981-10-31
178.	CM/L-0566454 1976-11-24	Assam Veneer (P) Ltd. Ledo (Assam)	IS : 10 (Part II)—1976	S.O. 3761 dated 1979-11-17	1981-11-15
179.	CM/L-0568357 1976-12-10	Jai Guru Engineering Co. (India) Howrah-711101	IS : 7932—1976	S.O. 3762 dated 1979-11-17	1981-11-30
180.	CM/L-0574352 1976-12-24	Chinthamani Hosiery Unit, Tirupur—636802	IS : 4964—1980	S.O. 3762 dated 1979-11-17	1981-12-15
181.	CM/L-0575657 1976-12-31	Southern Insecticides & Fertilizers Madras-600098	IS : 562—1978	S.O. 3762 dated 1979-11-17	1981-12-31
182.	CM/L-0595764 1977-03-21	Champion Engineers, Bombay-400063	IS : 2834—1964	S.O. 787 dated 1980-03-29	1981-10-15
183.	CM/L-0604941 1977-04-20	Sindichem Ltd. Distt. Wardha (Maharashtra)	IS : 3284—1965	S.O. 786 dated 1980-03-29	1981-11-30
184.	CM/L-0610229 1977-05-16	Champion Paint Colour & Varnish Co., Sahadara, Delhi-110032	IS : 428—1969	S.O. 283 dated 1981-01-24	1981-10-31
185.	CM/L-0639960 1977-09-14	General Aluminium Corporation, Bangalore-560022	IS : 205—1978	S.O. 920 dated 1981-03-31	1981-10-31
186.	CM/L-0641240 1977-09-20	Standard Brushware, Calcutta	IS : 384—1971	S.O. 920 dated 1981-03-21	1981-09-30
187.	CM/L-0646553 1977-10-19	Atulw ood Products Feroke, Kerala state	IS : 3084—1975	S.O. 921 dated 1981-03-21	1981-10-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
188.	CM/L-0647050 1977-10-19	Sur Enamel & Stamping Works Pvt. Limited, Calcutta-700014	IS : 933—1976	S.O. 921 dated 1981-03-21	1981-10-31
189.	CM/L-0651142 1977-10-31	Sur Enamel & stamping works Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta-700014	IS : 934—1976	S.O. 921 dated 1981-03-21	1981-10-31
190.	CM/L-0652245 1977-11-07	Sudershan Plywood Industries, Distt. Dibrugarh, Assam	IS : 1559—1969	S.O. 1223 dated 1981-04-18	1981-11-15
191.	CM/L-0652750 1977-11-09	Banerjee Engineerig Works, Calcutta-17	IS : 3564—1975	S.O. 1223 dated 1981-04-18	1981-11-15
192.	CM/L-0654350 1977-11-23	Sur Enamel & stamping Works Ltd., Calcutta-700014	IS : 2878—1976	S.O. 1223 dated 1981-04-18	1981-11-30
193.	CM/L-0655857 1977-11-24	Khatau Junkur Ltd., Bombay-400066	IS : 2834—1964	S.O. 1223 dated 1981-04-18	1981-11-30
194.	CM/L-0656859 1977-12-05	Plyjute Fabricators, Digboi P.O.-786171 Distt. Dibrugarh (Assam)	IS : 7406 (Part I)—1974	S.O. 1222 dated 1981-04-18	1981-11-30
195.	CM/L-0658257 1977-12-20	Shangrila Food Products Ltd., Bombay-400078	IS : 1011—1968	S.O. 1222 dated 1981-04-18	1981-12-15
196.	CM/L-0664353 1978-01-06	Metro Paint Inds New Delhi-110 027	IS : 5410—1969	S.O. 1615 dated 1981-05-30	1981-12-31
197.	CM/L-0668260 1978-01-24	Naffarchandra Jute Mills Ltd., Distt. 24 Parganas (West Bengal)	IS : 2566—1965	S.O. 1615 dated 1981-05-30	1982-01-15
198.	CM/L-0713037 1978-01-26	Industrial Founders & Engineers, Thana (Maharashtra)	IS : 774—1971	S.O. 2176 dated 1981-08-15	1981-11-30
199.	CM/L-0715950 1978-08-14	A.P. Industries, Bombay-400 306	IS : 1995—1974	S.O. 2180 dated 1981-08-15	1981-09-30
220.	CM/L-0716043 1978-08-16	Asian Wire Ropes Pvt. Ltd., Distt. Medak (A.P.)	IS : 1856—1977	S.O. 2180 dated 1981-08-15	1981-08-31
201.	CM/L-0716952 1978-08-17	Asian Wire Ropes (P) Ltd., Distt. Medak (AP)	IS : 2266—1977 IS : 2365—1977 IS : 2581—1977	S.O. 2180 dated 1981-08-15	1981-08-31
202.	CM/L-0721035 1978-09-11	Sparton Electricals, Bombay-400 013 (Maharashtra)	IS : 7538—1975	S.O. 2215 dated 1981-08-22	1981-11-15
203.	CM/L-0724244 1978-09-22	Shri Narayani Pipe Mfg. Co., Calcutta-700 002	IS : 4984—1972	S.O. 2215 dated 1981-08-22	1981-09-30
204.	CM/L-0727048 1978-10-12	Kamla Castings & Engineering Works, Howrah	IS : 2706—1969	S.O. 2218 dated 1981-08-22	1981-10-15
205.	CM/L-0727250 1978-10-12	Fyrkool Pvt. Ltd., Madras-600001	IS : 934—1976	S.O. 2218 dated 1981-08-22	1981-10-15
206.	CM/L-0727654 1978-10-17	James Huton & Co. Aror, Alleppey Distt.	IS : 10 (Part IV)—1976	S.O. 2218 dated 1981-08-22	1981-09-30
207.	CM/L-0729456 1978-10-30	Auto Ignition Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad-121 001	IS : 5977—1971	S.O. 2218 dated 1981-08-22	1981-10-31
208.	CM/L-0730340 1978-10-30	J.K. Day & Sons, Calcutta-700001 (W.B.)	IS : 7577—1975	S.O. 2218 dated 1981-08-22	1981-11-15
209.	CM/L-0733346 1978-11-08	P.V.S. Industries, Hospet-843 201 (Karnataka)	IS : 7121—1973	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	1981-11-15
210.	CM/L-0734348 1978-11-15	Hisan Insecticides Co. Vijayawada-520007 Krishna District (A.P.)	IS : 2567—1978	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	1981-11-15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
211. CM/L-0735350 1978-11-21	Shree Wire Rope Mfg. Co. Bhandup, Bombay-400048 (Maharashtra),	IS : 2266-1977	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	1981-11-30	
212. CM/L-0736655 1978-11-24	Singhal Industrial Corporation, Agra-282004.	IS : 1601-1960	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	1981-11-30	
213. CM/L-0737758 1978-11-28	Microbes India, Calcutta-700053	IS : 8268-1976	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	1981-11-30	
214. CM/L-0738659 1978-12-04	Hindustan Brown Boveri Ltd., Faridabad-121001	IS : 325-1978	S.O. 2270 dated 1981-08-29	1981-11-30	
215. CM/L-0746658 1979-01-10	Yali Kuitting Co., Tirupur-638602	IS : 4964-1980	S.O. 2277 dated 1981-08-29	1981-11-15	
216. CM/L-0799275 1979-09-11	Bhaskara Agro Chemicals & Cotton Industries, Guntur-522005 (A.P.).	IS : 565-1975	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	1981-09-15	
217. CM/L-0799679 1979-09-13	Yamuna Udyog, Yamuna Nagar-135001	IS : 10 (Part III) 1974	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	1981-09-30	
218. CM/L-0799780 1979-09-13	Somani Ferro Alloys Ltd. Kalyani, Distt. Nadia (W.B.).	IS : 6914-1978	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	1981-09-15	
219. CM/L-0799881 1979-09-13	Somani Ferro Alloys Ltd. Kalyani, Distt. Nadia (W.B.).	IS : 6915-1978	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	1981-09-15	
220. CM/L-0800436 1979-09-17	Triveni Steel P. Ltd. Ambattur, Madras-600098.	IS : 226-1975	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	1981-09-30	
221. CM/L-0801640 1979-09-21	Sri Bhaskara Agro Chemical & Cotton Industries, Guntur-522006 (A.P.).	IS : 2567-1978	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	1981-09-30	
222. CM/L-0801943 1979-09-24	Dhanalakshmi Chemicals, Panipat-632403 (T.N.)	IS : 261-1966	S.O. 1772 dated 1982-05-15	1981-09-30	
223. CM/L-0818657 1979-11-30	Gautam Electrical Motors Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.	IS : 7538-1975	S.O. 1832 dated 1982-05-22	1981-12-15	
224. CM/L-0824349 1979-12-24	Ganges Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Distt. Hooghly. (West Bengal)	IS : 1943-1964	S.O. 2320 dated 1982-07-03	1981-11-30	
225. CM/L-0824450 1979-12-24	Ganges Mfg. Co. Ltd. Bansberia	IS : 2874-1964 IS : 3751-1966	S.O. 2320 dated 1982-07-03	1981-11-30	
226. CM/L-0826454 1979-12-27	Hawarden Traders, Madurai-625 001 (T.N.)	IS : 4956-1977	S.O. 2320 dated 1982-07-03	1981-12-31	
227. CM/L-0829864 1980-01-10	Empire Jute Co. Ltd. Talpukur	IS : 2874-1964	S.O. 3104 dated 1982-09-04	1981-11-30	
228. CM/L-0896273 1980-09-03	Gesyes Agro Inds., Trivandrum-695020	IS : 1970 (Part I) 1974	S.O. 4614 dated 1985-12-24	1981-09-15	
229. CM/L-0896677 1980-09-11	Assam Udyog Co., Dibrugarh, Assam.	IS : 226-1975	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-09-15	
230. CM/L-0897275 1980-09-11	Shri Ambika Metal Works, Howrah-711240	IS : 226-1975	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-09-15	
231. CM/L-0897376 1980-09-11	do	IS : 1786-1966	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-09-15	
232. CM/L-0697578 1980-09-11	Jupiter Thermometers, Vijayawada-520004 (A.P.)	IS : 3055 (Part-I)-1977	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-09-30	
233. CM/L-0899380 1980-09-16	Yesman Hosiery Mills, Tirupur-638602	IS : 4964 1980	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-12-15	
234. CM/L-0806044 1979-10-16	Sri Bhaskara Agro Chemical & Cotton Industries, Guntur-522005 (A.P.)	IS : 633-1975	S.O. 1771 dated 1982-05-15	1981-10-31	
235. CM/L-0808856 1979-10-19	Seven Hills Agro Chemicals, Distt. Guntur (A.P.)	IS : 564-1975	S.O. 1771 dated 1982-05-15	1981-10-31	
236. CM/L-0809151 1979-10-29	Partap Steel Rolling Mills (P) Ltd Ballabhgarh (Haryana)	IS : 8500-1977	S.O. 1771 dated 1982-05-15	1981-11-15	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
237.	CM/L-0810439 1979-10-29	Laboratory & Industrial chemicals, Madras-600029 (T.N.)	IS : 695—1975	S.O. 1771 dated 1982-05-15	1981-11-15
238.	CM/L-0811340 1979-10-30	Bhagathram Latex Industries, Distt. Trivandrum (Kerala)	IS : 4148—1967	S.O. 1771 dated 1982-05-15	1981-11-15
239.	CM/L-0812241 1979-11-07	Seven Hills Agro chemicals, Distt. Guntur (A.P.)	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 1832 dated 1982-05-22	1981-11-15
240.	CM/L-0812847 1979-11-12	Agro Chemicals of India, Satpur, Nasik-422007 (Maharashtra)	IS : 562—1978	S.O. 1832 dated 1982-05-22	1981-11-15
241.	CM/L-0812948 1979-11-12	-do-	IS : 561—1978	S.O. 1832 dated 1982-05-22	1981-11-15
242.	CM/L-0815449 1979-11-21	P.R. Traders, Howrah-711101	IS : 780—1969	S.O. 1852 dated 1982-05-22	1981-11-30
243.	CM/L-0816552 1979-11-26	Skoda (India) Pvt Ltd (Engg. Division), Arkonam-631002 North Arcot Distt. (TN)	IS : 7593 (Part I)—1975	S.O. 1832 dated 1982-05-22	1981-11-30
244.	CM/L-0817554 1979-11-29	New Avishkar Ghaziabad-201001 (U.P.)	IS : 4654—1974	S.O. 1832 dated 1982-05-22	1981-12-15
245.	CM/L-0818556 1979-11-30	Coal Industrial Corporation, Faridabad (Haryana)	IS : 2202 (Part I)—1973	S.O. 1832 dated 1982-05-22	1981-12-15
246.	CM/L-0900945 1980-09-25	Ichalkaranji Machine Centre Pvt Ltd. Ichalkaranji (Maharashtra)	IS : 6750—1972	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-09-30
247.	CM/L-0901341 1980-09-26	Bright Wires Ltd 24 Parganas (W.B.)	IS : 398 (Part II)—1976	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-10-15
248.	CM/L-0902141 1980-09-30	Aravali Chemical Laboratories, Jaipur-302013 (Rajasthan)	IS : 1061—1975	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-10-15
249.	CM/L-0903244 1980-09-30	Phoenix Oil Co., (India) Pvt Ltd Kanpur Cantt-208004 (U.P.)	IS : 493—1958	S.O. 4614 dated 1983-12-24	1981-10-15
250.	CM/L-0908355 1980-10-27	The Bharath Steel Rolling Mills, Salem-636002 Tamilnadu	IS : 1977—1975	S.O. 4613 dated 1983-12-24	1981-11-15
251.	CM/L-0913853 1980-11-20	Yawalkar Pesticides Pvt Ltd. Nagpur (Maharashtra)	IS : 3903—1975	S.O. 644 dated 1984-03-03	1981-11-30
252.	CM/L-0915655 1980-11-20	Southern Engineering Industries, Coimbatore-641037 (TN)	IS : 6595—1972	S.O. 644 dated 1984-03-03	1981-11-30
253.	CM/L-0919158 1980-11-28	Sri Vasavi Pesticides, Salem-636012 (Tamil Nadu)	IS : 633—1975	S.O. 644 dated 1984-03-03	1981-12-15
254.	CM/L-0919259 1980-11-28	-do-	IS : 565—1975	S.O. 644 dated 1984-03-03	1981-12-15

का. धा. 3974—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विनियम 1955 के विनियम (7) के उपविनियम (3) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विभिन्न उत्पादों की प्रति इकाई मुहर लगाने की फीस अनुसूची में दिए गए व्योरो के अनुसार निर्धारित की गई है। यह फीस प्रत्येक के मामले की गई तारीख से लागू होगी :

अनुसूची					
क्रम संख्या	उत्पाद/उत्पाद की श्रेणी	तत्संबंधी भारतीय मानक की संख्या और शीर्षक	प्रति इकाई	मुहर लगाने की प्रति इकाई फीस	लागू होने की तारीख
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	एक मार्ग वाली आयतनी फ्लास्क	IS : 915—1975 एकमार्क वाली आयतनी फ्लास्कों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	एक फ्लास्क	(1) पहली 10000 इकाइयों के लिए 15 पैसे प्रति इकाई (2) 10001 वीं इकाई से 20000 इकाइयों तक के लिए 10 पैसे प्रति इकाई (3) 20001वीं इकाई और उससे अधिक इकाइयों के लिए 5 पैसे प्रति इकाई	1985-12-01
2.	घरेलू कार्यों के लिए हाथ और पैर चालित सिलाई की मशीनें	IS : 1610—1981 घरेलू कार्यों के लिए सिलाई की मशीनों की सामान्य अपेक्षाओं की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	एक सिलाई मशीन	(1) पहली 50000 इकाइयों के लिए 20 पैसे प्रति इकाई, और (2) 50001वीं इकाई और इससे अधिक इकाइयों के लिए 10 पैसे प्रति इकाई	1983-12-16
3.	रेल गाड़ी में प्रकाश करने के पट्टे	IS : 6583—1972 रेल गाड़ी में प्रकाश करने के पट्टों की विशिष्टि	एक मी2	3 पैसे	1984-01-01
4.	मिथाइल ब्रोमाइड गैस के लिए बोलिडत गैस कर्जन इस्पात के गैस सिलिंडर	IS : 7682—1975 मिथाइल ब्रोमाइड गैस के लिए बोलिडत गैस कर्जन इस्पात के गैस सिलिंडरों की विशिष्टि	एक सिलिंडर	(1) पहली 10000 इकाइयों के लिए 5 पैसे प्रति इकाई, और (2) 10002वीं और इससे अधिक इकाइयों के लिए 4 पैसे प्रति इकाई	
5.	धान के छिलके उतारने की मशीन के लिए रबड़ के रोल	IS : 8427—1977 धान के छिलके उतारने की मशीन के रोल की विशिष्टि	एक मर	20 पैसे	1985-07-16

[सं सी एम 3/13 : 10]

S. O. 3974:—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that the marking fee(s) per unit for various products details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been determined and the fee(s) shall come into force with effect from the dates shown against each:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking fee per unit	Date of Effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)
1.	One-mark volumetric flasks	IS: 915-1975 Specification for one-mark volumetric flasks (first revision)	One Flask	(1) 15 Paise per unit for the first 10000 units (2) 10 Paise per unit for the 10001 st to 20000 units, (3) 5 Paise per unit for the 20001st unit and above	1985-12-01
2.	Sewing machines for household purposes hand and foot operated	IS: 1610-1981 Specification for general requirements for sewing machines for household purposes (first revision)	One sewing machine	(1) 20 Paise per unit for the first 50000 units and (2) 10 Paise per unit for the 50001st unit and above	1983-12-16

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
3. Train lighting belting	IS: 6583-1972 Specification for train-fighting belting	One m ²	3 paise		1984-01-01
4. Welded low carbon steel gas cylinders for methyl bromide gas	IS: 7662-1975 Specification for welded low carbon steel gas cylinders for methyl bromide gas	One cylinder	(1) Rs 5.00 per unit for the first 10000 units and (2) Rs 4.00 per unit for the 10001st unit and above		1985-03-01
5. Rubber roll for paddy de-huskar	IS: 8427-1977 Specification for rubber roll for paddy de-huskar	One Piece	20 Paise		1985-07-16

[No. CMD/13:10]

का. मा. 3975—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिन्ह) विनियम, 1955 के नियम 3 के उपविनियम 2 तथा विनियम 3 के उपविनियम (2) और (3) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था एाद्वारा अधिबूचित किया जाता है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों के ध्योरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे तिथि 1984-02-29 को निर्धारित किए गए हैं :—

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	निर्धारित भारतीय मानकों की पद संख्या एवं शीर्षक	नए भारतीय मानक द्वारा प्रतिष्ठित भारतीय मानक या मानकों, यदि कोई है, का पद संख्या एवं शीर्षक	अन्य विवरण
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. IS: 292—1983 सोला युक्त पीतल के इंगटों एवं छलौ वस्तुओं की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 292—1961 पीतल के इंगटों एवं छलौ वस्तुओं की विशिष्टि (पुनरीक्षण)	—	
2. IS: 1448 (पी: 44)—1983 पेट्रोलियम और उसके उत्पादों की परीक्षण पद्धतियां (पी: 44) विद्युत्प्रमिति अनुमापन पद्धति द्वारा शोमीन संख्या (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 1448 (पी: 44)—1968 पेट्रोलियम और उसके उत्पादों की परीक्षण पद्धतियां पी: 44 विद्युत्प्रमिति अनुमापन द्वारा शोमीन संख्या (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	—	
3. IS: 1448 (पी: 113)—1983 पेट्रोलियम और उसके उत्पादों की परीक्षण पद्धतियां पी: 113 बिमानन टेबलिन ईंधन में कुल शक्लता का निर्धारण	---	---	
4. IS: 1734 (भाग 1 से 20)—1983 प्लाईवुड की परीक्षण पद्धतियां (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 1734 (भाग 1 से 20)—1972 प्लाईवुड की परीक्षण पद्धतियां (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	---	
5. IS: 2079—1983 पेंटल स्लिपो के लिए ग्रेफाइट की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 2079—1962 पेंटल स्लिपो के ग्राफाइट की विशिष्टि	---	
6. IS: 2704—1983 शीत क्षति शीर्ष के और मशीनीकृत पुर्जों के लिए पीतल के तारों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 2704—1964 शीत क्षति शीर्ष के और मशीनीकृत पुर्जों के लिए पीतल के तारों की विशिष्टि	---	
7. IS: 2720 (भाग 8)—1983 मृदा परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 8 भारी घनता द्वारा जलांश—शुष्क घनत्व संबंधी ज्ञात करना (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 2720 (भाग 8)—1974 मृदा परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 7 भारी घनता द्वारा जलांश—शुष्क घनत्व संबंधी ज्ञात करना (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	---	
8. IS: 3400 (भाग 8)—1983 चकनीकृत रबड़ी की परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 8 द्वारा प्रतिरोधिता (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3400 (भाग 8)—1967 चकनीकृत रबड़ी की परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 8 द्वारा प्रतिरोधिता	---	
9. IS: 3498—1983 धातु के मेज (कार्यालय टाइप) की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 3498—1975 धातु की मेज (कार्यालय टाइप) की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	---	

1	2	3	4
10.	IS 3521—1983 औद्योगिक सुरक्षा पेटियाँ एवं माज (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS : 3521—1965 लाईनमन के लिए बगड़े की सुरक्षा पेटि एवं पट्टा की विनिष्टि	
11.	*IS:3625—(भाग 1)—1983 इन्सुलिंग स्पिंडलों और गोल क्लॉस के लिए ताता तत्वों की विनिष्टि भाग 1 सामान्य (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	IS:3625—1971 एयुनिफ़ाईड फ्लग टाईप घुरियों में प्रयोग हेतु ताता तत्वों की विनिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	*भारतीय मानक संस्था प्रमाणित बिन्दु परियों जना हेतु IS : 3625(भाग 1) 1983, दिनि 1983-08-16 में लागू होगी।
12.	IS:4986—1963 वर्षा मापी (रिकार्ड न करने वाले) के संस्थापन और वर्षामापन की रीति संहिता (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS 4986—1968 वर्षा मापी (रिकार्ड न करने वाले) के संस्थापन और वर्षामापन की रीति संहिता	—
13.	IS:6390—1983 कपड़े धोने की मशीनों की धरेख मशीनों की विनिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 6390—1971 कपड़े धोने की मशीनों की धरेख मशीन (असंश्लित)	—
14.	IS : 6884—1983 देश मिकेट सीमेंट की विनिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 6884—1973 देश मिनिट्रेड सीमेंट की विनिष्टि	—
15.	IS:6932(भाग II)—1983 इमारती चूने की परीक्षण पद्धतियाँ भाग II चुने चूने का ठोस होने का समय ज्ञात करना	—	—
16.	IS:8074—1983 मोनोकोटोकासु जल धुलनशील मान्द्र की विनिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 8074—1976 मोनोकोटोकासु जल धुलन-शील मान्द्र की विनिष्टि	—
17.	IS:8133—1983 कृषि ट्रैक्टरों एवं मशीनरी पर बालक नियन्त्रणों के स्थापन एवं बालक की मार्गदर्शिका (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS:8133—1976 कृषि ट्रैक्टरों एवं मशीनरी बालक नियन्त्रणों के स्थापन एवं बालक की मार्गदर्शिका	—
18.	IS:9631—1983 आई एस ओ मीटर पैच की चूषियों (साईज रेंज एम 1 से एम 40 सहित) के लिए "गो" और "नो गो" रङ्ग प्पग गेजों और रङ्ग चेक प्पग गेजों के प्रमापी व्यवस्था की विनिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 9631—1980 आई एस ओ मीटर पैच की चूषियों (साईज रेंज एम 1 से एम 40 सहित) के लिए "गो" और "नो गो" रङ्ग प्पग गेजों और रङ्ग चेक प्पग गेजों के प्रमापी व्यवस्था की विनिष्टि	—
19.	IS:9713—1983 विद्युत चालकों के लिए गरम वेल्डित विद्युत बिस्लेषी ताबों की तार छड़ों की विनिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	IS: 9713—1980 विद्युत चालकों के लिए गरम वेल्डित विद्युत बिस्लेषी ताबों की तार छड़ों की विनिष्टि	—
20.	IS:10696(भाग 1/खण्ड 1)—1983 रेडियल दबवाजों एवं उनके हार्डस्टों के निर्माण, परीक्षण और रख-रखाव की निष्कारिणें भाग 1 उत्पीड़न के समय निरीक्षण परीक्षण एवं समुच्चय खण्ड 1 द्वारा	—	—
21.	IS:10144—1982 डीजल वाहनों के लिए इन्ड्रानिक गतिसीमिष्टि की विनिष्टि	—	1982-06-30 को स्थापित
22.	IS:10620—1983 उड़द (काला चना) बड़ा मिश्रण की विनिष्टि	—	—
23.	IS:10667—1983 पाव एवं टांग की रखा हेतु औद्योगिक सुरक्षा उपस्कर के चयन की मार्गदर्शिका	—	—
24.	IS:10670—1983 पशु आहार संघटक के रूप में बजिनिया तम्बाकू बीष केक की विनिष्टि	—	—
25.	IS:10671—1983 पशु आहार संघटक के रूप में ग्राम के बीष की गिरी की विनिष्टि	—	—
26.	IS:10672—1983 भेड़ एवं बकरी के पूरक चारे के रूप में खनिज मिश्रण की विनिष्टि	—	—
27.	IS :10679—1983 फोटोविद्युत स्पेक्ट्रोफोटोमापी (एक किरण वाले) की विनिष्टि	—	—

1	2	3	4
28	IS: 10693 (भाग 1)—1983 सीमेंट संयंत्र से भिन्नकणिक पदार्थ की उत्सर्जक सीमा भी 1 भट्टे	---	---
29	IS: 10704—1983 मिट्टी हटाने की मशीनरी के अभि- गमन तंत्रों के डिजाइन की मार्गदर्शिका	---	---
30	IS: 10707—1983 प्रोफार्मल पद्धति द्वारा सतही खुरद- रापन सामने के उपकरण	---	---
31	IS: 10708—1983 गुणोत्ता लागत विश्लेषण की मार्गदर्शिका		
32	IS: 10734—1983 साचा वासित मियारबान की विशिष्टि		
33	IS: 10738 (भाग 10)—1983 तरंगपथको का कोरी की की विशिष्टि, भाग 1 सामान्य अपेक्षाएं एवं परीक्षण	---	---
34	IS: 10740—1983 विद्युत चालित टेक भाग उपकरणों की प्रचालन अपेक्षाओं की सिफारिश	---	---
35	IS: 10741—1983 पशु आहार के संघटक के रूप में अम्बाड़ी (डिब्रिस्कस कनायिनग) के क की विशिष्टि	---	---
36	IS: 10743—1983 इपि ट्रैक्टरों का मुख्य केन्द्र भाग करने की पद्धति	---	---
37	IS: 10750 (भाग 1)—1983 फोटोग्राफी स्टैंडर्ड केबल रिलीज की विशिष्टि, भाग 1 टिप एवं साफ्ट के फिटिंग माप		
38	IS: 10752—1983 अर्थ टेलरों पर लगाने के लिए लैडिंग गियर के माप एवं परीक्षण अपेक्षाएं	---	---
39	IS: 10758—1983 गन्धहरण-सह-रंग गुणनाशी तरल सामग्रियों की विशिष्टि	---	---
40	IS: 10764—1983 उबाल कार्य के लिए अदाय टाइप के पैन की विशिष्टि	---	---
41	IS: 10765—1983 कृषिगत तन्तु की बातेदार एवं जेयोनेट आकार की विशिष्टि, चिमटियों की विशिष्टि	---	---
42	IS: 10766—1983 फिष ज्वील युग्मन के आरोपण माप	---	---

इन भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक संस्था, मानक संस्था, मानक भवन, 1 बहादुरसाह जकर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली 110002, बम्बई-400007, कलकत्ता-700072, मद्रास-600113 और मोहाली 160051 स्थित इसके क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों तथा अहमदाबाद-380001, बंगलूर-560002, भोपाल 462003, भुवनेश्वर 751011, हैदराबाद-500001, जयपुर-302005, कानपुर-208005, पटना, 300013, और त्रिवेन्द्रम स्थित शाखा कार्यालयों में विक्री के लिए उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. सी एम डी/13 : 2]

S. O.3975:—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of Rule 3 and Sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulation 3 of Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules and Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standard (s), Particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established on 1984-02-29:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standards Established	No. and Title of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Remarks, if any
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS: 292-1933 Specification for leaded brass ingots and castings (Second Revision)	IS: 292-1961 Specification for brass ingots and castings (Revised)	---
2.	IS: 1448 (P:44)-1983 Methods of test for petroleum and its products; (P: 44) Bromine number by electrometric titration method (Second Revision)	IS: 1448 (P: 44)-1968 Methods of test for Petroleum and its products; P: 44 Bromine number by lelectrometric titration method (First Revision)	---
3.	IS: 1448 (P: 113)-1983 Methods of test for petroleum and its products. (P: 113) Determination of total acidity in aviation turbine fuel	---	---

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4. IS: 1734 (Parts 1 to 20)-1983 Methods of test for plywood (Second Revision)	IS: 1734 (Parts I to XX)-1972 Methods of test for plywood (First Revision)	—	—
5. IS: 2079-1983 Specification for graphite for pencil slips (First Revision)	IS: 2079-1962 Specification for graphite for pencil slips	—	—
6. IS: 2704-1983 Specification for brass wires for cold headed and machined parts (First Revision)	IS: 2704-1964 Specification for brass wire for cold headed and machined parts	—	—
7. IS: 2720 (Part 8)-1983 Methods of test for soils; Part 8 Determination of water content/dry density relation using heavy compaction (Second Revision)	IS: 2720 (Part VIII)-1974 Methods of test for soils; Part VIII Determination of water content; dry density relation using heavy compaction (First Revision)	—	—
8. IS: 3400 (Part 8)-1983 Methods of test for vulcanized rubbers; Part 8 resistance to crack-growth (First Revision)	IS: 3400 (Part VIII)-1967 Methods of test for vulcanized rubbers; Part VIII Resistance to crack-growth	—	—
9. IS: 3498-1983 Specification for metal table (office type) (Second Revision)	IS: 3498-1975 Specification for metal tables (Office type) (First Revision)	—	—
10. IS: 3521-1983 Specification for industrial safety belts and harnesses (First Revision)	IS: 3521-1965 Specification for hoeman's leather safety belt and strap	—	—
11. *IS: 3625 (Part 1)-1983 Specification for warp tubes for ring spinning and doubling spindles; Part 1 General (Second Revision)	IS: 3625-1971 Specification for warp tubes for use on aluminium plug type spindles (First Revision)	—	*For purposes of ISI Certification Marks Scheme; IS: 3625 (Part 1)-1983 shall come into force with effect from 1984-08-16
12. IS: 4986-1983 Code of practice for installation of raingauge (non-recording type) and measurement of rain (First Revision)	IS: 4986-1968 Code of practice for installation of raingauge (non-recording type) and measurement of rain	—	—
13. IS: 6390-1983 Specification for domestic electric clothes washing machines (First Revision)	IS: 6390-1971 Specification for domestic electric clothes washing machine (Non-automatic)	—	—
14. IS: 6884-1983 Specification for dental silicate cement (First Revision)	IS: 6884-1973 Specification for dental silicate cement	—	—
15. IS: 6932 (Part 11)-1983 Methods of tests for building limes; Part 11 Determination of setting time of hydrated lime	—	—	—
16. IS: 8074-1983 Specification for monocrotophos water soluble concentrates (First Revision)	IS: 8074-1976 Specification for monocrotophos water soluble concentrates	—	—
17. IS: 8133-1983 Guidelines for location and operation of operator controls on agricultural tractors and machinery (First Revision)	IS: 8133-1976 Guidelines for location and operation of operator control on agricultural tractors and machinery	—	—
18. IS: 9631-1983 Specification for Gauging members for go and no go screw plug gauges and screw check plug gauges for ISO metric screw threads (size range from M1 up to and including M 40) (First Revision)	IS: 9631-1980 Specification for gauging members for Go and NO GO screw plug gauges and screw check plug gauges for ISO metric screw threads (size range from M1 up to and including M 40)	—	—
19. IS: 9713-1983 Specification for hot-rolled electrolytic copper wire rods for electrical conductors (First Revision)	IS: 9713-1980 Specification for hot rolled electrolytic copper wire rods for electrical conductors	—	—
20. IS : 10096 (Part 1/Sec 1)-1983 Recommendations for inspection, testing and maintenance of radial gates and their holsts; Part I Inspection, testing and assembly at the manufacturing stage; Section 1 Gates.	—	—	—
21. IS : 10144-1982 Specification for electronic speed limiters for diesel vehicles	—	Established on 1982-06-30	—
22. IS : 10620-1983 Specification for urd (black gram) vada mix	—	—	—
23. IS : 10667-1983 Guide for selection of industrial safety equipment for protection of foot and leg	—	—	—
24. IS : 10670-1983 Specification for virginia tobacco seed cake as livestock feed ingredient	—	—	—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
25.	IS : 10671-1983 Specification for mango seed kernels as livestock feed ingredient	—	—
26.	IS : 10672-1983 Specification for mineral mixtures for supplementing sheep and goat feeds	—	—
27.	IS : 10679-1983 Specification for photoelectric spectrophotometer (single beam type)	—	—
28.	IS : 10693 (Part 1)—1983 Limits for emission of particulate matter from cement plants; Part 1 Kilns	—	—
29.	IS : 10704-1983 Guidelines for design of access systems of earth-moving machinery	—	—
30.	IS : 10707-1983 Instruments for measurement of surface roughness by profile method	—	—
31.	IS : 10708-1983 Guide for the analysis of quality costs	—	—
32.	IS : 10734-1983 Specification for case, vanity, moulder body	—	—
33.	IS : 10738 (Part I)—1983 Specification for flanges for waveguides; Part 1 General requirements and tests	—	—
34.	IS : 10740-1983 Recommendation for operating requirement for power take-off driven implements	—	—
35.	IS : 10741-1983 Specification for ambadi (<i>hibiscus cannabinus</i>) cake as livestock feed ingredient	—	—
36.	IS : 10743-1983 Method for determination of centre of gravity of agricultural tractors	—	—
37.	IS : 10750 (Part I)—1983 Specification for shutter cable release, photographic; Part 1 fitting dimensions of tip and socket	—	—
38.	IS : 10752-1983 Dimensions and testing requirements of landing gear for mounting on semitrailers	—	—
39.	IS : 10758-1983 Specification for de-odourizing-cum-disinfectant fluids	—	—
40.	IS : 10764-1983 Specification for boiling pan, non-pressure type	—	—
41.	IS : 10765-1983 Specification for forceps, dissecting, toothed and bayonet shaped, Cushing's pattern	—	—
42.	IS : 10766-1983 Mounting dimensions for fifth-wheel coupling	—	—

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Indian Standards Institution, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and also from its Regional Offices : Bombay-400007, Calcutta-700072, Madras-600113 and Mohali-160051 and branch offices at Ahmedabad-380001, Bangalore-560002, Bhopal-462003, Bhubaneswar-751014, Hyderabad-500001, Jaipur-302005, Kanpur-208005, Patna-300013 and Trivandrum-695001.

[No. CMD/13 : 2]

क्र.सं. 3976—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विभाग) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 8 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन 188 लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं वे लाइसेंसधारियों को मानक सम्बन्धी सुझाव देने का अधिकार देते हुए मार्च 1984 में स्वीकृत किए गए हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या सीएम/एल	वैधता की अवधि से	तक	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	IS : पदनाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	सीएम/एल—1284247 1984-03-02	84-03-18	85-03-15	अलिशा मणीन इंस्टीट्यूट, मोकुल रोड, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट हुबली-580030	IS : 1726 (भाग 3)—1974

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
2. सीएम/एल—1284348 1984-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	ट्रांस केबल्स लि., काठगार्जन 283126 जिला नैनीताल	IS : 398 (भाग 2)—1976	
3. सीएम/एल—1284449 1984-03-05	"	"	विनायगर इंजी. वर्क्स, 59 एमसी रोड, बागमरमै नपेट, मद्रास-600021	IS : 8348--1979	
4. सीएम/एल—1284550 1984-12-17	"	"	हरियाणा कोनकास्ट लि. पो. श्री. सतरोड हिसार (हरियाणा)	IS : 6914--1978	
5. सीएम/एल—1284651 1984-12-17	"	"	शिवमणी स्टील ट्रूथ्स लिमिटेड 16वां कि. मी. पत्थर हुवाइटफील्ड रोड, बंगलौर-560048	IS : 9295--1979	
6. सीएम/एल—1284752 1984-12-17	"	"	आगरा सीमेंट पाव्वा फक्टरी पो. श्री. उद्योगनगर, आगरा मधुरा रोड, (समीप : कवचमहाय बेलमगंज, आगरा)	IS : 458--1971	
7. सीएम/एल—1284853 1984-03-05	"	"	मनोज इंटरप्राइजेज, प्लाट नं. 1 डी वी गुप्ता रोड, करीमबाग, नई दिल्ली-110005	IS : 4760--1979	
8. सीएम/एल—1284954 1984-03-05	"	"		IS : 4260--1979	
9. सीएम/एल—1285047 1984-03-06	"	"	बी एस एक इंडस्ट्रीज, 5-डी/85 रेवने रोड, मन आई टी करीबाबाद-121001 (हरियाणा)	IS : 4780--1979	
10. सीएम/एल—1285148 1984-03-06	"	"	साउदन मिलिडरस प्रा. लि. इस्मापुर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया पासमालार गांव रोड, इस्मापुर, पाटनचेर समिति, मेडक जिला, (समीप : 47 संतोष नगर, मेहदीपटनम, हैदराबाद)	IS : 3196--1974	
11. सीएम/एल—1285249 1984-12-17	"	"	कृष्णक परमेश्वरी इंजी. प्रा. लि. सर्वे नं. 773, समीप गणेश मंदिर गांव रुद्रान, दो क्यू संगारेड्डी, जिला मेडक (समीप : 4-8-75 7 गोवलीगुड, हैदराबाद-500012)	IS : 3196--1974	
12. सीएम/एल—1285350 1984-12-17	"	"	देवमा इंजी. प्रा. लि. सर्वे नं. 518 किस्सुपुर, गांव, मेडक तालुक, रंगारेड्डी जिला (समीप पहली मंजिल, अलाक नं. सी. स्म नं. 208 कर्ण सेंटर, समीप : मितरवा सिटेंटर, एम डी रोड, सिकंदराबाद)	IS : 3196--1974	
13. सीएम/एल—1285451 1984-03-06	"	"	बलजीत विट्पूमेस, गुंडलापोबासमाली मेडकल तालुक, आरआर जिला (समीप : 7-3-716 राधूपति रोड, सिकंदराबाद)	IS : 217--1971	
14. सीएम/एल—1285552 1984-12-17	"	"	निटाल स्टील लिमिटेड, कृष्णराजपुरम हुवाइटफील्ड रोड, बंगलौर-560048 (कार्यालय : 29/2, के एल रोड, बंगलौर-560027)	IS : 7887--1976	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
15. सीएम/एल-1285653 1984-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	स्टीलथर्भ इंडस्ट्रियल प्रा. लि. 44, तीसरा फास, इंडस्ट्रियल सबमर्ब 11, मुमकर रोड, नेम्राउट, यशवंतपुर, बंगलोर-560022 (कार्यालय: केम्बेल हाउस, 11 मुमकर रोड, यशवंतपुर, बंगलोर-560022)	IS : 804--1967	
16. सीएम/एल-1285754 1984-12-17	"	"	पी एम सी इंडस्ट्रियल इन्स्ट्रूट प्रवितागो रोड, पोलावेडु, कोयम्बटूर-641004	IS : 5595--1980	
17. सीएम/एल-1285855 1984-03-06	"	"	संगीर प्लास्टिक प्रा. लि. ए-1/2213, तीसरा फेज जीआरडीसी, नापे-396195 (कार्यालय: 102 मरीन गुरु तारा रोड, बम्बई-400049)	IS : 4984--1978	
18. सीएम/एल-1285956 1984-03-06	"	"	मांडुप बम्बई-400078 (कार्यालय: प्लाट नं. 635/1-2-3, रतन इंडस्ट्रीज कम्पाउंड, एलवीएस मार्ग, मांडुप, सोनापुर, सम्मुख प्रहवानी)	IS : 2253--1977	
19. सीएम/एल-1286049 1984-12-17	"	"	केथरी स्टीलस इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया नं. 1, प्रगिरा-बम्बई रोड, देवास-455001 (कार्यालय: 9/4 मनोरमा गंज, स्ट्रीट नं. 5, हवीर 452001)	IS : 6914--1978	
20. सीएम/एल-1286150 1984-12-17	"	"	इंडियन स्प्रिंग एण्ड जेनरल इंजी. कं. माहुडा मोड, पो. प्रो. माहुडा-826305 जिना धनबाद (बिहार)	IS : 1135--1973	
21. सीएम/एल-1286251 1984-12-17	"	"	उडीसा ऐस्युमिनियम प्राइवेट लि. बो-34 इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, कटक	IS : 204(भाग 2)--1978	
22. सीएम/एल-1286352 1984-12-17	"	"	जायवहाल स्टील रोलिंग विंग वेड बहागांव, नेशनल हाईवे नं. 37, गोवाहाटी, 781010 (कार्यालय: प्रयाग मंजिल, कपाल मार्किट टी आर फूकन रोड, गोवाहाटी-781001)	IS : 1786--1979	
23. सीएम/एल-1286453 1984-12-17	"	"	अनम उद्योग कम्पनी मानकोटा रोड, डिब्रुगढ़-786001(अनम)।	IS : 1786-1979	
24. सीएम/एल-1286554 1984-03-06	"	"	कामाख्या उद्योग, गांव वीरकुशी नारंगी, गोवाहाटी-781026 (कार्यालय: 12 गुरु रोड (वेस्ट) गोवाहाटी-781024)	IS : 4985-1981	
25. सीएम/एल-1286655 1984-12-17	"	"	ठाकुरदास सुरेका इंजी. का. प्रा. लि., 10 ठाकुरदास सुरेका रोड, घुसुरी हावड़ा-711107 कार्यालय: 5 गणेश चन्द्र ऐवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-700013)	IS : 1728-1979	
26. सीएम/एल-1286756 1984-03-06	"	"	संगम डेरी, द गंदर जिला, मिल्क प्राइवेट को-ऑपरेटिव यूनिट्स लि. बडलाभुव-522213 सेनासी सांखु गंदर जिला,	IS : 1547-1968	
27. सीएम/एल-1286857 1984-03-05	"	"	संतोष ब्रदर्स एस जी मार्ग (भूर), मुलदहहर (कार्यालय: सिविल लाइन मुलदहहर-2030001)	IS : 9020-1979	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
28. सीएम/एल-1286958 1984-03-06	84-03-16	85-03-15	भारति स्प्रिंग्स, 32 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया फगवाड़ा (पंजाब)	IS : 3652-1982	
29. सीएम/एल-1287051 1984-03-06	"	"	इंडो जर्मन एग्रीकल्चरल रिपेयरिंग एंड प्रेसिंग वर्क्स, सर्माप चांद सिनेमा जी टी रोड, मुधियाना, (कार्यालय : 1 जवाहर मार्केट, ब्लॉक टावर, मुधियाना)	IS : 1971-1982	
30. सीएम/एल-1287152 1984-03-06	"	"	जैन एग्रीकल्चरल कार्पो, फगवाड़ा। रोड, हाथियारपुर (पंजाब)	IS : 9020-1979	
31. सीएम/एल-1287253 1984-03-06	"	"	प्लास्टो रबड़ इंडस्ट्रीज, 21 सोलपट्टी रोड, कलकत्ता-700010 (कार्यालय : 12/23 साउथ कूलिया रोड, कलकत्ता-700010)	IS : 5382-1969	
32. सी एम/एल—1287354 1984-03-06	"	"	केमिकल्स एण्ड इंजेनिटींग्स, रामनगर कंठमा, पो. श्री. सीमा, गोरखपुर (कार्यालय : सार्क बैम्बर्स, हिल्सी बाजार गोरखपुर)	IS : 4323—1980	
33. सी एम/एल-1287455 1984-03-06	"	"	जी. टी. एन. टेक्सटाइल्स लि., एशमाबाब अलमार्क 683101 (केरला) कार्यालय पो. बा. नं. 101 अलवाय (जिला-683101)	IS : 834—1975	
34. सी एम/एल-1287556 1984-03-06	"	"	विजय फाउंडरी एण्ड इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स स्टेशन रोड, खुराही (जिला मागूर)	IS : 9020—1979	
35. सी एम/एल—1287657 1984-03-06	"	"	सुपर को. मोरख नेशन, 94-ए, संत नगर, समीप नेहरू प्लेस, नई दिल्ली-110019	IS : 4246—1978	
36. सी एम/एल—1287758 1984-03-07	"	"	जंता एग्री इंडस्ट्रीज, सूरतगढ़ रोड, श्री गंगानगर-335001 (राजस्थान)	IS : 9020—1979	
37. सी एम/एल—1287859 1984-03-27	"	"	जंता इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स, जी.टी. रोड, मोंगा (पंजाब)	IS : 9020—1979	
38. सी एम/एल—1287960 1984-03-07	"	"	भारत एग्रीकल्चरल कार्पोरेशन, पैजेंटिक रोड, मोंगा (पंजाब)	IS : 9020—1979	
39. सी एम/एल—1288053 1984-03-07	"	"	बनसल इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स पैजेंटिक रोड, मोंगा-142001 (पंजाब)	IS : 9020—1979	
40. सीएम/एल—1288154 1984-03-07	"	"	राजस्थान एग्री इंडस्ट्रीज 22/23 जी इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट श्री गंगानगर (कार्यालय : 153, तारकटोर मार्केट श्री गंगानगर)	IS : 9020-1979	
41. सी एम/एल—288255 1984-12-17	"	"	द जय इंजी वर्क्स लि., यूनिट ऊपा सेविंग मशीन वर्क्स, 183 ए, प्रिंस अनवर शाह रोड, कलकत्ता-700068	IS : 1610—1981	
42. सीएम/एल-1288356 1984-03-08	"	"	मालाबार सीमेंट्स लि., बालायर ईम पो. श्री. पालाघाट-678624 (कार्यालय : श्रीमा टी. एस. एम. कमप्लेक्स बिल्डिंग, रेलवे स्टेशन, रोड, पालाघाट-678001)	IS : 269—1976	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
43. सी एम/एल--1288457 1984-03-08	84-03-16	85-03-15	मोदी स्टील वर्क्स प्रैक्टिस. कं. प्लॉट नं. 15 इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, मद्रास, (कार्यालय : 33 कस्तूरी रंगा आश्रम रोड, मद्रास-600018,	IS: 6003--1970	
44. सी एम/एल--1288558 1984-03-08	"	"	इंटर कामस्यूटिकल्स (इंडिया) प्रा. लि. अशोका सिनेमा बिल्डिंग, पटना-800001	IS: 1061--1978	
45. सी एम/एल--1288659 1984-03-08	"	"	इंडियन कामिनिविल सिडिकेट, 11/12, चेद्री पालायम रोड, पादनपुर, कोयम्बटूर--641023 (कार्यालय : 66 वेकटस्वामी रोड, (बेस्ट) आर एस पुरम, कोयम्बटूर-641002)	IS: 2052--1979	
46. सी एम/एल--1288760 1984-12-17	"	"	राज सिन्डिकेट एण्ड कंटेनर्स प्रा. लि. प्लॉट नं. 2, भाइट ए, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया मथुरा (कार्यालय : 51 अनंदनोक नई दिल्ली-110049)	IS: 3196--1974	
47. सी एम/एल 1288861 1983-12-17	"	"	गुजरात मोटर पम्प प्रा. लि.-1/एम/59 बी पी एन आई टी सम्मुख न्यू बस स्टैंड करीदाबाद-121001 (हरियाणा)	IS: 896-1979	
48. सी एम/एल. --1288962 1984-03-09	"	"	सुपर पोलिप्लस्टर प्रा. लि., ई-56 से ई-59 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, उम्राव (कार्यालय : 26/109 बी, कीलबासा, भातपुर-208001)	IS: 4985--1981	
49. सी एम/एल--1289055 1984-12-17	"	"	कुशल उद्योग, डी-44 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया मेरठ रोड, गाजियाबाद, (उ.प्र.)	IS: 1239(भाग 2)--1969	
50. सी एम/एल--1289156 1984-03-08	"	"	कूटा फलम डॉर एण्ड फर्निचर कम्पनी प्रा. लि. पूनामाली हाई रोड, कोयंबटूर मद्रास-600107	IS: 2202 (भाग 1)--1973	
51. सी एम/एल--1269257 1984-03-08	"	"	गुजरात ऐश्री इंडस्ट्रीज कार्पोरेशन लि., पेस्टीवाइड्स फार्मलेशन यूनिट, सम ए आई टी आई नेशनल हाईवे नं. 8 बा, गेडल (जिला राजकोट, (कार्यालय : क्षेत्र उद्योग भवन सम्मुख हाई कोर्ट, नवरंग पुरा, अहमदाबाद)	S: 8446--1977	
52. सी एम/एल-1289358 1984-03-08	"	"	वि अल्टा मैड वर्क्स, 28बी, मिमको कालोनी, रिजर्व लेन, सिवकाशी (तमिलनाडु) (कार्यालय : 12 ए थियरमैन थामुगनगर रोड, सिवकाशी-626123)	IS: 2653-1980	
53. सी एम/एल-1289459 1984-03-09	"	"	रायल रबड़ वर्क्स, एस एच माउंट पो.ओ. कोट्टायम-686006 (केरला)	IS: 1741-1960	
54. सी एम/एल-1289560 1984-12-17	"	"	विश्वकर्मा जिमनास्टिक, जी-75, नरमोनगर, दिल्ली-110092	IS: 2312-1967	
55. सी एम/एल-1289661 1984-03-09	"	"	शक्ति इंडस्ट्रीज, 21-1-546 बार महल, हैबरा- बाद-500264 (आन्ध्र प्रदेश)	IS: 5348-1981	
56. सी एम/एल-1289762 1984-03-09	"	"	महावीर सोमेट वर्क्स, प्रा. लि. 12 बा कि सी पथर, बिहान रोड, महारनपुर (कार्यालय : गर्वनमेट ब्रुड सोजनिंग, प्लान अजी महंगा- रान, साहरनपुर-247001)	IS: 269-1976	
57. सी एम/एल-1289863 1984-03-09	"	"	गुणवत् इंडस्ट्रीज, "लोवा" कबल किलोन-691007 (तमिलनाडु)	IS: 4148-1987	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
58. सी एम/एल-1289964 1984-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	मोहन मेटल इंडस्ट्रीज, ई-133, इन्द्रप्रस्था इंड- स्ट्रियल एरिया, कोटा	IS : 9020-1979	
59. सी एम/एल-1290040 1984-03-09	"	"	एनवालेक वेंटेस, 70 नजफगढ़ रोड, नई दिल्ली-110015	IS : 427-1965	
60. सी एम/एल-1290141 1984-12-17	"	"	ग्लोब जनरल इंडस्ट्रीज, 12/21/1 कविता कालोनी, नांगलोई, दिल्ली-110041	IS : 3832-1971	
61. सी एम/एल-1290242 1984-03-09	"	"	साउथन केमिकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज डी. नं. 8/558/4 काली गार्डन, पेडाकाकानी साम्भूर-522508 गुंटूर जिला (आन्ध्र प्रदेश)	IS : 261-1982	
62. सी एम/एल-1290343 1984-03-09	"	"	सेतरोन इंडस्ट्रियल अलाईस लि. त्रिकलायाना इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया घोरंगाबाव (एम एस) (कार्यालय : 219 भद्रवाह इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, न्यू सन मिल कम्पाउण्ड, लुन्नर पारेल, बम्बई- 400013)	IS : 10198-1982	
63. सी एम/एल-1290444 1984-03-09	"	"	राजस्थान केमिकल्स कारपोरेशन, एफ-43 मधुकर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, बाधामी, फेज-1, जोधपुर- 342005 (कार्यालय : चूडीगधर, जोधपुर- 342001)	IS : 6047-1970	
64. सी एम/एल-1290545 1984-12-17	"	"	सुशील एग्रो सर्विसेज, 5 कर्तारपुरा बैस गोदाम, जयपुर-302006	IS : 9020-1979	
65. सी एम/एल-1290646 1984-12-17	"	"	कॉकण केबल्स, प्लाट नं. बी-4 गणेश खाद पोली इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया चिपलम (जिला रतनगिरी)	IS : 1554 (भाग 1)-1976	
66. सी एम/एल-1290747 1984-03-09	"	"	फिनोलेक्स प्लास्टिक्स प्रा. लि. प्लाट नं. 10 ब्लाक "सी" पिपरी विषवाङ्क इंडल, एरिया, चिचवाड़ा, पूना-411019 (कार्यालय : 28/3, बम्बई-पूना रोड, पिम्परी, पूना-411018)	IS : 7834 (भाग 8)-1975	
67. सी एम/एल-1290848 1984-12-17	"	"	कॉकण केबल्स, प्लाट नं. बी-4, गणेश खादपोली इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया चिपलम (जिला रतनगढ़)	IS : 694-1977	
68. सी एम/एल-1290949 1984-03-20	"	"	नागराजन सीमेंट्स लि. मेट्टापल्ली हुजूर नगर, तालुक नलगोडा जिला (कार्यालय : 1-3-298/ 2ए/1 प्रभोकरनगर, हैदराबाद-20)	IS : 269-1976	
69. सी एम/एल-1291042 1984-12-17	"	"	जे मार फीबीटर्स प्रा. लि. प्लाट नं. 338, हलोल- बहावरगुहाई, समीप सयका गांव, हलोल 389350 (जिला रचमहल) (कार्यालय : 3/एफ ओ बिल्डिंग रानाडे रोड, दादरा, बम्बई-400028)	IS : 3196-1974	
70. सी एम/एल-1291143 1984-03-21	"	"	ऊषा टेलीफोन्स लि. पो. धो. चंदननगर बज बज रोड, 24 परगना (कार्यालय : 33, जितरंजन एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-12)	IS : 8421-1977	
71. सी एम/एल-1291244 1984-12-17	"	"	गुजरात स्टेट कोयामपरेटिव मार्किटिंग फेडरेशन लि. नरोल बाटा रोड, नरोल, ग्रहमवाबाव (कार्यालय : शाहकार भवन रिलीफ रोड, ग्रहमवाबाव-380001)	IS : 8074-1976	
72. सी एम/एल-1291345 1984-03-21	"	"	ब सलेम डिस्ट्रिक्ट को-ऑप मिक्स्ड प्रोडक्शंस, पूनीयल लिमिटेड, मिहानपुर, धयलवाडीपेट्टी, पो. धो. सलेम-636302	IS : 1185-1975	
73. सी एम/एल-1291345 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	गुजरात एग्रो केमिकल्स मैम्बु. फौ. कम्पनी 151- 153/1 जी माई डी सी इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, नरोल, ग्रहमवाबाव	IS : 5277-1978	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
74. सी एम/एल-1291547 1984-03-21	84-04-01	85-03-31	स्पेनर प्राटो इंडस्ट्रिज प्रा. लि. प्लाट नं. 132, IS : 4246-1978 सेक्टर 24, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा)		
75. सी एम/एल-1291648 1984-12-17	"	"	मुद्रसन प्लाईवुड इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि., ए टी रोड, IS : 1328-1982 मारबेरिता डिस्ट्रिक्ट, भसम (कार्यालय : 4 फेयरलेन प्लेस, कलकत्ता-700001)		
76. सी एम/एल-1291749 1984-12-17	"	"	विक्टर केबल्स कारपोरेशन, 185 डी टी रोड, IS : 694-1977 शाहिबाबाद (उ.प्र.)		
77. सी एम/एल-1291850 1984-12-17	"	"	श्री दिग्विजय सीमेंट कम्पनी (एस्टेब्लिशमेंट्स) IS : 459-1970 चिबिजन) दिग्विजयनगर, अहमदाबाद-382470		
78. सी एम/एल-1291951 1984-12-17	"	"	ऊषा सीमेंट एण्ड केमिकल्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, IS : 269-1978 सिड्डींग रोड, नादनी रेलवे, कासिंग, उपलेटावे- 360490		
79. सी एम/एल-1292044 1984-12-17	"	"	कामनी इंडोनि. कारपोरेशन लि., तारि रोड, IS : 6914-1978 भावनगर-364006		
80. सी एम/एल-1292145 1984-12-17	"	"	मोती इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि., IS : 398 (भाग 1) 1978 प्लाट नं. 6 एमआरडीसी, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, हिंगन रोड, नागपुर		
81. सी एम/एल-1292246 1984-03-21	"	"	सोपन सिडिकेट, बृंगरी-396375, IS : 8029-1978 जिला बलसार, गुजरात राज्य		
82. सी एम/एल-12922347 1984-03-21	"	"	एमो इन्विपमेंट्स (इंडिया) प्लाट नं. 88 IS : 4760-1979 सेक्टर 24, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा) (कार्यालय : एच ओ 7868, रोगनारा रोड, दिल्ली-110007)		
83. सी एम/एल-1292448 1984-03-21	"	"	मानवी मिनरल्स प्रा. लि., दौलताबाद रोड, IS : 6960-1978 गुडगांव (हरियाणा) (कार्यालय : 10-ए, राजेंद्र मेशन अनसारी रोड, दरियागंज, नई दिल्ली-110002		
84. सी एम/एल-1292549 1984-03-21	"	"	मिनरल फेस एलॉयस, 60/11, डीएचएफ IS : 4760-1979 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया 1, फरीदाबाद-121003 (हरियाणा)		
85. सी एम/एल-1292650 1984-12-17	"	"	मराठवाडा इलेक्ट्रिकल्स, IS : 2567-1978 प्लाट नं. 27, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, विधाना धाना औरंगाबाद (कार्यालय : कृष्णा बंगला, नई उसमानपुर औरंगाबाद)		
86. सी एम/एल-1292751 1984-03-21	"	"	गुजरात इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लि., प्लाट नं. 805/ IS : 8445-1977 805, जीआई डीसी इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, पो. बा. नं. 90, अकलेखर-393002 (कार्यालय क्षेत्र उद्योग भवन, सम्मुख हाई कोर्ट, अहमदाबाद)		
87. सी एम/एल-1292852 1984-03-21	"	"	पो. राम धन्व एंड कंपनी वर्मती नाल IS : 417 (भाग 1) 1974 जालंधर-144002 (पंजाब)		
88. सी एम/एल-1292953 1984-12-17	"	"	सुपरिम इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, IS : 365-1963 58/2 सुब्रमण्यम रोड, बंगलोर-560061		
89. सी एम/एल-1293046 1984-12-17	"	"	आयकास्ट इंडिया कार्पोरेशन 127, IS : 398 (भाग 2) 1978 इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, मिलघाता-396230 बाबरा एंड नागर हवेली		

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
90. सीएम/एल-1293147 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	एसोसिएटेड सीमेंट लि. लिमिटेड, पोरबंदर सीमेंट वर्क्स, ओल्ड भिनिस्ट्री ग्राउंड्स एरोड रोड, पो. ओ. पोरबंदर-360575 (प. रेलवे) (गुजरात)	IS : 269—1976	
91. सीएम/एल-1293248 ¹ 1984-12-17	"	"	सून फास्टिंग एंड इंजी. लै. प्रा. लि., 77/5 बनारस रोड, हावड़ा (कार्यालय : 20 मुल्की स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700007)	IS : 7191—1974	
92. सीएम/एल-1293349 1984-12-17	"	"	एल्कास्ट इंडिया कार्पोरेशन (श्री तपाड़िया बेनीफेनसरी ट्रस्ट) 127, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, मिलवामिया-396230, दादरा एंड नगर हवेली	IS : 398 (भाग 1) 1976	
93. सीएम/एल-1293450 1984-12-17	"	"	कामनो इंड्रो. कार्पोरेशन लि., नरि रोड, भावनगर-364006	IS : 6915—1973	
94. सीएम/एल-1293551 1984-12-17	"	"	गुजरात स्टील ट्रूथ लि., काशी समीप माबरमती, अहमदाबाद-382470	IS : 9295—1979	
95. सीएम/एल-1293551 1984-12-17	"	"	जे के स्टील पो. ओ. रिमरा, जिला हुगली (प. बं.) (कार्यालय : 7 कौनमिन हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700054)	IS : 1786—1979	
96. सीएम/एल-1293753 1984-12-17	"	"	अंत्रिका आयरन एंड स्टील वर्क्स एंड पी-रोलिंग मिल, नैजपुर भोगा, समीप जी डी हार्ड स्कूल, अहमदाबाद-381345	IS : 1786—1979	
97. सीएम/एल-1293854 1984-12-17	"	"	इलेक्ट्रोमोशन 25, चंडीतला बांग रोड, कलकत्ता-700053	IS : 2148—1968	
98. सीएम/एल-1293955 1984-12-17	"	"	सिलमानस इंटरनेशनल लिमिटेड नं. 11, /316 भुवकोकड़ साउथ प्रमूगल रोड, रोड बिकलाकड़-21 (कार्यालय : 42/520 पावर हाउस रोड, पो. बा. नं. 1941 कोचीन-682018)	IS : 10 (भाग 4)—1976	
99. सीएम/एल-1294048 1984-12-17	"	"	अयश्री टिम्बर इंडस्ट्रीज गोपालपाड़ा टाउन, पो. प्रा. बालाहमरि, जिला गोपालपाड़ा (असम)	IS : 10 (भाग 2)—1976	
100. सीएम/एल-1294149 1984-12-17	"	"	इंटरनेशनल प्लास्टिक्स एंड पाइप्स प्रा. लि., 503-ए, जी आई डी सी इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, बड़ोदा डोंडरा सन रोड, हालोल, जिला पंचमहल (ईस्ट) बम्बई-400057	IS : 4985—1986	
101. सीएम/एल-1294450 1984-12-17	"	"	डी पी गैस एंड कंपनी, बी-3, सेक्टर 3, नोएडा काम्प्लेक्स, जिला गाजियाबाद (उ.प्र.)	IS : 362—1983	
102. सीएम/एल-1294351 1984-12-17	"	"	हिमालय रबर प्राइवेट लि., कल्याणी इंड. इस्टेट, प्लॉट नं. 24 ब्लॉक डी, पो. ओ. कल्याणी, जिला भादिया (प. बं.) कार्यालय : पीएनबी हाउस एनेक्सी 18 बी, सादीन रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS : 2494—1974]	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
103. सी एम/एल-1294452 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-21	भाल्छा सीमेंट कं. लि. दुर्गा सीमेंट वर्क्स, दुर्गापुर, दवापल्लीपोस्ट, गुडूर जिला	IS : 455—1976	
104. सी एम/एल-1294553 1984-12-17	"	"	जय श्री बुड प्राइवेट पो. प्रो. रूपई सिडिंग, हुमना, जिला डिब्रूगढ़ (असम)	IS : 10(भाग 2)—1976	
105. सी एम/एल-1294654 1984-12-17	"	"	मोती इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि. प्लॉट नं. 6 एम भाइबोसी इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, द्विगन रोड, नागपुर	IS : 398(भाग 2)—1976	
106. सी एम/एल-1294755 1984-12-17	"	"	बीरमगाम रोसिंग मिल (प्रा.) लिमिटेड, उद्योगनगर, बीरमगाम-382150	IS : 1786—1979	
107. सी एम/एल-1294856 1984-03-22	"	"	सालबाकुमार निडिंग 7-ए/12 हार्ड स्कूल रोड, तिरुपुर 638601(त. ना.)	IS : 4964—1980	
108. सी एम/एल-1294957 1984-03-22	"	"	हरबंसलाल मल्होत्रा एण्ड संस, 40 बेलूर स्टेशन रोड, पो. प्रो. बेलूरमठ त्रिवेणी 711202(बैस्ट बंगाल)	IS : 10198—1982	
109. सी एम/एल-1295050 1984-03-22	"	"	द मिक्स होजरी मिल, 18 मिक्को इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, हार्बे रोड, तिरुपुर-638602(त. ना.)	IS : 4964—1980	
110. सी एम/एल-1295151 1984-03-22	"	"	पीके मिल, 90-ए/4 कामराज रोड, तिरुपुर-638604(त. ना.)	IS : 4964—1980	
111. सी एम/एल-1295252 1984-03-22	"	"	मिपमैन होमरीज, 3-बी, अण्णाबीनगर तीमरा स्ट्रीट, कॉन्ग्रेस मैदान रोड, तिरुपुर-638607 (त. ना.)	IS : 4964—1980	
112. सी एम/एल-1295353 1984-03-22	"	"	मोडय निडिंग कम्पनी, 1(2) अलगाडू, कल्लमपालायम तिरुपुर-638604(त. ना.)	IS : 4964—1980	
113. सी एम/एल-1295454 1984-03-22	"	"	श्रीदीपी टेक्सटाइल, 16 म्युनिसिपल कालोमी, कल्लमपालायम, तिरुपुर-638604(त. ना.)	IS : 4964—1980	
114. सी एम/एल-1295555 1984-12-17	"	"	कमिलाल चुम्मी लाल एण्ड संस एप्लायड प्रा. लि., 3 जवाहर लाल रोड, उद्योगनगर उधना-394210(गुजरात)	IS : 4159—1976	
115. सी एम/एल-1295656 1984-12-17	"	"	शशी टिम्बर एण्ड प्लाईवुड इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि. पो. प्रो. उटुलवाड़ी, जिला जलपाइगुड़ी (नोर्ष बंगाल) कार्यालय : 33/1 नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-700001)	IS : 10(भाग 2)—1976	
116. सी एम/एल-1295757 1984-12-17	"	"	सेनी इंडस्ट्रियल कॉर्पोरेशन, 41-बी इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जोतबाड़ा जयपुर-302012	IS : 774—1971	
117. सी एम/एल-1295858 1984-12-17	"	"	श्री हरि वायर्स, 321 जैन टैम्पल गली स्वामीनारायण इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट वास्तावेवडी रोड, सुरत	IS : 694—1977	
118. सी एम/एल-1295959 1984-12-17	"	"	तमिलनाडु स्टील (ए यूनिट प्राफ तमिलनाडु इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन, लि., ऐन्नुनगर, ऐराकोनम-631004	IS : 226—1975	
119. सी एम/एल-1296052 1984-12-17	"	"	सफेस फायर सर्विसेस, 202 "ए" धनराज इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, सन मिल्स रोड, कुन्नर पेरल(बैस्ट) बम्बई-400013	IS : 2878—1976	
120. सी एम/एल-1296153 1984-12-17	"	"	जी के स्टील एण्ड इंडस्ट्रीज मेटलपलायम रोड, के. बाबमबुराई कोयम्बटूर-641017	IS : 226—1975	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
121.	सी एम/एल-1296254 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	बंगाल हैमर इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि. 58/1 मासी- पंचगारा स्ट्रीट काशी मजुमदार रोड, पो ग्रो धुसुरी हावड़ा (कार्यालय : 135 प्रोश घोष रोड प्लॉट नं. 35 बी, पो ग्रो बेलूरमठ, हावड़ा)	IS : 1786--1979
122.	सी एम/एल-1296355 1984-12-17	"	"	ब्ल्यू स्टार इलेक्ट्रोप्लास्टरम, ब्ल्यू स्टार बिल्डिंग 3 अक्षितनगर स्टेशन प्लॉट, राजकोट-360002	IS : 6750--1972
123.	सी एम/एल-1296456 1984-12-17	"	"	जयकिशन मैयूफैक्टरिंग कार्पोरेशन तांती रोड, 4 माबड़ी प्लॉट राजकोट-360004	IS : 10001--1981
124.	सी एम/एल-1296557 1984-12-17	"	"	नेशनल सी-रोलिंग मिक्स ब्रावास्टील बिल्डिंग, सम्मुख : रेलवे स्टेशन, कापटी-441001 जिधा नागपुर (कार्यालय : 88 केनाल रोड, रामदास पेट नागपुर-440010)	IS : 226--1975
125.	सी एम/एल-1296658 1984-12-17	"	"	एपेक्स स्टेलिम स्टील एण्ड नोम-फैरम एम्बाय स्टील (प्रा.) लि., 67वां मीन, हावड़ा रोड, मोडीबासा, पोस्ट बंगलौर-560089 (कार्यालय : नं. 28, "ए" स्नाक, प्रथम मंजिल, बालाजी कमप्लेक्स, मुनतान- पेट, बंगलौर-560053)	IS : 1786--1979
126.	सी एम/एल-1296759 1984-12-17	"	"	गैस्ट कीम बेल्जियमस लि. 97 अंबुल रोड, हावड़ा--711101	IS : 1148--1973
127.	सी एम/एल-1296860 1984-12-17	"	"	" " "	IS : 1977--1975
128.	सी एम/एल-1296961 1984-12-17	"	"	" " "	IS : 226--1975
129.	सी एम/एल-1297054 1984-12-17	"	"	गुजरात स्टील ट्यूब्स लि. काली समीप मावरमति, अहमदाबाद-382470	IS : 1978--1971
130.	सी एम/एल-1297155 1984-12-17	"	"	सफेकम फियर सविसेम, 202 ए खनराज इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, सन मिल रोड, मोमर परेश (प.) बम्बई-400013	IS : 5490(भाग 1)--1977
131.	सी एम/एल-1297256 1984-12-17	"	"	उत्कल वेस्टिमाइड्स एण्ड केमिकल्स पो.ग्रो. जगतनाथपुर जिला, गंजम (उड़ीसा) (कार्यालय : स्टेशन रोड, ब्रह्मपुर-7600005)	IS : 1307--1982
132.	सी एम/एल-1297357 1984-12-17	"	"	मदन इलेक्ट्रिक कं. प्र. लि. सी आई बी/2402, 2403, जी आई डी सी फेज, III, वापि-396195 जिला वनसाह	IS : 325--1978
133.	सी एम/एल-1297458 1984-12-17	"	"	शिवमणी स्टील स्ट्रक्चर लि., 16 वां किमी परवर, बंगलौर, इन्डिस्ट्रियल रोड, बंगलौर-560048 (कार्यालय : 560048, (कार्यालय : पुष्पक पोर्बो. नं. 2556, नं. 2/4 प्रथम मंजिल, अमनपार्क, ब्रंटन रोड, बंगलौर-560025)	IS : 3801--1966
134.	सी एम/एल-1297559 1984-12-17	"	"	आजाद इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स बिर्हीवाला रोड, भटिंडा-151001	IS : 10001--1981
135.	सी एम/एल-1297660 1984-12-17	"	"	माडीलेक्स प्लास्टिक प्रा. लि., रोड नं. 41 कुसगांव, तालुका, धोर जिला पुना, (कार्यालय : हिरा हाउस, 381 एस बी पी रोड, बम्बई-400001)	IS : 4935--1981

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
136. सी एम/एल-1297761 1984-12-17	"	"	एम सी शाहनी एण्ड कं. (विल्ली) प्रा. लि., 12/1 मील, मयुरा रोड, फरीदाबाद-121003 (कार्यालय: 34-बी, कनाट प्लेस, नई दिल्ली-1)	IS: 220—1972	
137. सी एम/एल-1297862 1984-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	पंजाब कृषि उद्योग समीप बस स्टैंड दमोहा (एम पी)	IS: 9020—1979	
138. सी एम/एल-1297963 1984-03-21	84-04-01	85-03-31	लोटस पेस्टिसाइड्स पोस्ट, सबरी स्टेशन, फालना, जिला पाली (राजस्थान)	IS: 8291—1978	
139. सी एम/एल-1298056 1984-12-17	"	"	ए टी डी ए मिनि सीमेंट प्रोजेक्ट, मोहनलाल गंज, लखनऊ (उ. प्र.)	IS: 269—1976	
140. सी एम/एल-1298157 1984-12-17	"	"	गुप्ता रबड़ इंडस्ट्रीज, इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट दिल्ली रोड, सहारनपुर-247001	IS: 1891 (भाग 1)—1978	
141. सी एम/एल-1298258 1984-12-17	"	"	विश्व स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स, 134-135 स्माल इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, भंडारा रोड, नागपुर-440008	IS: 226—1975	
142. सी एम/एल-1298359 1984-12-17	"	"	भगइ इंटरप्राइजेज, 211, जी आई डी सी इंडल. इस्टेट, उमरगांव जिला बलसाड	IS: 7538—1975	
143. सी एम/एल-1298460 1984-12-17	"	"	अमन इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स, 84 अमन नगर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जालंधर-144004	IS: 779—1978	
144. सी एम/एल-1298561 1984-12-17	"	"	एन एम कार्पोरेशन, सी-17 इंडस्ट्रियल फोकल प्लाईट, जालंधर	IS: 1879 (भाग 1,2,3,6,10— —1975	
145. सी एम/एल-1298662 1984-12-17	"	"	के पी मंडल एण्ड संस, 68/69 पंचतला रोड, हावड़ा-711101 (कार्यालय: 208/1 पंचतला रोड, हावड़ा-711101)	IS: 780—1980	
146. सी एम/एल-1298763 1984-12-17	"	"	एस एम एफ इंडस्ट्रीज, 152 अविनाशी रोड, पीलमेहू पी ओ, कोयम्बटूर-641004	IS: 7538—1975	
147. सी एम/एल-1298864 1984-03-23	"	"	भाग्यलक्ष्मी निर्दिष्ट, 8 पिटबम्पावायम लेन, तिरुपुर-638602	IS: 4964—1980	
148. सी एम/एल-1298965 1984-12-17	"	"	नार्वेन मिनिस्ट्रस प्रा. लि. बौलताबाद रोड, गुडगांव (हरियाणा) (कार्यालय: 19-ए, राजेन्द्र मेहन, अन्तारी रोड, बरियागांव, दिल्ली-110002)	IS: 2865—1978	
149. सी एम/एल-1299058 1984-03-23	"	"	एकबालीक पेंटस, 70 नजफगढ़ रोड, नई दिल्ली-110015	IS: 168—1973	
150. सी एम/एल-1299159 1984-12-17	"	"	ऊमा इंडस्ट्रीज, अमनकुलाम रोड, पाप्पानिकेनपलायम, कोयम्बटूर-641037	IS: 7538—1975	
151. सी एम/एल-1299260 1984-12-17	"	"	वेस्ट कास्ट आइरन एण्ड स्टील, पोट्टाबा कन्नानोर	IS: 226—1975	
152. सी एम/एल-1299361 1984-12-17	"	"	गणेश ओयल इंडनस, 17 भक्तिनगर स्टेशन, प्लाट राजकोट-360002	IS: 10001—1981	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
153. सी एम/एल-1299462 1984-03-23	84-04-01	85-03-31	जे के जूट मिल्स कं. लि. कालपी रोड, फजलगंज, कानपुर	IS: 2566--1865	
154. सी एम/एल-1299563 1984-12-17	"	"	पद्म भूषण फोरजिनस, सी-30, फोकल प्वाइंट, जालंधर सिटी-144004	IS: 778--1980	
155. सी एम/एल-1299664 1984-12-17	"	"	श्री दिग्विजय सीमेंट कम्पनी लि., दि विजय नगर, ग्रहमशाबाद-382470	IS: 1592--1980	
156. सी एम/एल-1299765 1984-12-17	"	"	डियाणा केसमैट्स, 100, सीलसंन मेनिकस मुडलिगार रोड, ममिजकाराई, मद्रास-29	IS: 6248--1979	
157. सी एम/एल-1299866 1984-12-17	"	"	श्री राम स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स कोलसेट रोड, समीप पावर हाउस, थाणा (कार्यालय: पीटिया इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, ब्रायू यूनियन विंग बिज, दादखाना, दादखाना, बम्बई-400010	IS: 226--1975	
158. सी एम/एल-1299967 1984-03-23	84-03-16	85-03-15	ए सी सी लि. गगन सीमेंट वर्क्स, पी ओ बारासर-174013 जिला बिलासपुर (हि. प्र.)	IS: 1489--1976	
159. सी एम/एल-1300017 1984-12-17	"	"	"	IS: 269--1976	
160. सी एम/एल-1300118 1984-03-23	84-04-01	85-03-31	एलबीप्रार फोडस एण्ड मिटरल्स प्रा. लि. 39, कोवरानेबसीन रोड, मद्रास-21 (कार्यालय: 2 यट्टेमुडियाप्पन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600001)	IS: 2052--1979	
161. सी एम/एल-1300219 1984-12-17	"	"	मा इंडस्ट्रियल झांसी शिवपुरी रोड, करेरा (जिला शिवपुरी)	IS: 9020--1979	
162. सी एम/एल-1300320 1984-12-17	"	"	अशोक फाउन्ड्री एण्ड इंजी. वर्क्स, जी टी रोड, शाहबाद, मारकंडा, (हरियाणा)	IS: 9020--1979	
163. सी एम/एल-1300421 1984-03-23	"	"	खेतान सिङ्को लि. खौरोबार, देवरिया रोड, गोरखपुर (उ. प्र.)	IS: 1011--1981	
164. सी एम/एल-1300522 1984-03-23	"	"	जेन इण्डस्ट्रियल मैयूफैक्चरिंग कं., प्लॉट सं. 160 उद्योग बिहार फेज 1, एच एस/डी सी इंडस्ट्रियल कॉम्प्लेक्स, हुंडाहेड़ा, गुडगांव-122016 (हरियाणा)	IS: 4246--1978	
165. सीएम/एल-1300623 1984-12-17	84-04-16	85-04-15	प्रकाश इंजीनियरिंग इंटरप्राइजेज, ए-193, पीम्प, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट बंगलौर-560058	IS: 9301--1982	
166. सीएम/एल-1300724 1984-12-17	"	"	एस एस इंटरप्राइजेज, गांव बड़ भाजरा पी ओ वावन तहसील, खरड़ (रोपड़) (कार्यालय: एच नं. 52 फेज 4 मोहाली)	IS: 458--1971	
167. सीएम/एल-1300825 1984-12-17	"	"	विश्व.स. प्रॉयल इंजिन्स, 1243/86-87 शिवजी उद्योगनगर, कोल्हापुर 416008	IS: 10001--1984	
168. सीएम/एल-1300926 1984-12-17	"	"	पापलर केबल इंडस्ट्रीज, प्लॉट नं. 119 रोड नं. 18, एम प्र.ई डी सी ग्रंथेरी (ई) बम्बई-400093	IS: 694--1977	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
169. सीएम/एल-1301019 1984-12-17	84-04-16	85-04-15	जी इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि. 74, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, सतपुरा नासिक-422007	IS : 4480 (भाग 1)—1967	
170. सीएम/एल-1301120 1984-12-17	"	"	जिवल (इंडिया) लिमिटेड, 4, धर्मतला रोड, बेलूरमठ, हावड़ा (कार्यालय : 2/1, अहम मनुज स्ट्रीट लिलुआ-हावड़ा-711204	IS : 3589—1981	
171. सीएम/एल-1301221 1983-12-17	84-04-16	85-04-15	कुमलय केबल इंडस्ट्रीज, जीधार्गाव फरनटियर चेक पोस्ट, जिला जलपाईगुड़ी वेस्ट बंगाल	IS : 694—1977	
172. सीएम/एल-1301322 1984-12-17	"	"	कामहोमर्स मेक्सबेन इंडिया, पी-271 बेगलोर रोड, हावड़ा-711108	IS : 3832—1971	
173. सीएम/एल-1301423 1984-12-17	"	"	गोयल स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज, 57, मालीपंचगार रोड, लिलोह, हावड़ा (कार्यालय : 207, महर्षि देवेन्द्र रोड, कलकत्ता-700070)	IS : 1786—1979	
174. सीएम/एल-1301524 1984-12-17	"	"	भार के बुड कास्टर्स, उदयरजपुर जैसोर रोड, 24 परगना (कार्यालय : 14वां नेताजी सुभाष रोड, प्रथम मंजिल, कलकत्ता-700001)	IS : 10 (भाग 2)—1976	
175. सीएम/एल-1301625 1984-12-17	"	"	भारत एम्रो इंडस्ट्रीज, 8 मावडी प्लाट, राजकोट-360004	IS : 10001—1981	
176. सीएम/एल-1301726 1984-12-17	"	"	महेन्द्र इलेक्ट्रिक कलस, कमला मिशन रोड, नाडियाड (पं. रेलवे) गुजरात	IS : 9857—1981	
177. सीएम/एल-1301827 1984-12-17	"	"	मुकेश मेटल बॉन्स कं. मावडी प्लाट राजकोट-360004	IS : 10325—1982	
178. सीएम/एल-1301928 1984-12-17	"	"	अशोक मेटल इंडस्ट्रीज, मावडी प्लाट राजकोट-360002 कार्यालय, टेगोर रोड, राजकोट-360002 (गुजरात)	IS : 10325—1982	
179. सीएम/एल-1302021 1984-12-17	"	"	अशोक ड्रायरन एंड स्टील फैब्रिकेटर्स मावडी प्लाट राजकोट-360004	IS : 10325—1982	
180. सीएम/एल-1302122 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	गुरु नानक एमीकल्चरल इंडस्ट्रीज, श्री टी रोड, खुर्जा-203131	IS : 9020—1979	
181. सीएम/एल-1302223 1984-03-28	84-04-16	85-04-15	ब इस्टर्न मैयुफैक्टरिंग क. लि. 1, प्रली हैबर रोड, पो. ओ. टी. गढ़ जिला 24 परगना (प. ब.)	IS : 2818 (भाग 2)—1971	
182. सीएम/एल-1302324 1984-03-28	"	"	श्री हनुमान जूट एंड लामेंटिंग इंडस्ट्रीज, 40/2 "ए" रोड, बामनगाछीसलेखीय हावड़ा (प. ब.) (कार्यालय : 12-बी, रस्तेल स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700071)	IS : 7406 (भाग 2) 1980	
183. सीएम/एल-1302425 1984-03-28	"	"	"	IS : 7406 (भाग 1)—1974	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
184. सीएम/एल-1302526 1984-12-17	"	"	पावगिलवाड़ इलेक्ट्रिकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज मैन्युफैक्चरर्स प्राईवेट लिमिटेड मशीनरी मंगलदास, मार्किट मकीला-444001 (महाराष्ट्र)	IS : 9020—1979	
185. सीएम/एल-1302627 1984-03-28	"	"	किलवेस्ट इंडस्ट्रीज सारावली बाहानू रोड, जिला : बाणा (कार्यालय : एच-2-10 बंगुर नगर, एम जी रोड, गोरेगांव बम्बई-400090)	IS : 4323—1980	
186. सीएम/एल-1302728 1984-03-29	"	"	कोहिनूर पेंटिंग (प्रा.) लि. समीप रेलवे स्टेशन, छेदरटा-143105 (भ्रमृतसर) (कार्यालय : 13 ग्राफ़ी, रत्न चंद रोड, ब माल भ्रमृतसर-143001)	IS : 5419—1969	
187. सीएम/एल-1302829 1984-03-29	84-04-16	85-04-15	नीवेज एप्लायंसेस (प्रा.) लि. प्लॉट नं. 257, सेक्टर 24, प्लॉट नं. 257, फरीदाबाद-121005 (हरियाणा)	IS : 4760—1979	
188. सीएम/एल-1302930 1984-03-29	"	"	वजन इंजीनियर्स (प्रा.) लि., 396 बीर सावरकर मार्ग, प्रभादेवी, बम्बई-400025	IS : 9798—1981	

[सं. सीएमबी 13. 11]

S.O. 3976.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that One hundred and eighty eight 'licences' particulars of which are given in the following schedule, have been granted during the month of March 1984 authorising the licensees to use the standards marks :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. (CM/L)	Period of Validity From	To	Name and Address of the Licensee	IS : Designation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	CM/L-1284247 1984-03-02	84-03-16	85-03-15	Alinda Machine Industries, Gokul Road, Industrial Estate, Hubli-580030	IS : 1726 (Pt III)—1974
2.	CM/L-1284348 1984-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	Trans Cables Ltd, Kath Garden 263126 Distt Nainital	IS : 398 (Pt II)—1976
3.	CM/L-1284449 1984-03-05	-do-	-do-	Vinayagar Engg. Works, 59, M.C. Road, Washermanpet, Madras-600021	IS : 8248—1979
4.	CM/L-1284550 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Haryana Concast Ltd. P.O. Satrod Hissar (Haryana)	IS : 6914—1978
5.	CM/L-1284651 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Shivmoni Steel Tubes Limited 16th K.M. Stone Whitefield Road Bangalore-560048	IS : 9295—1979
6.	CM/L-1284752 1984-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	Agra Cement Pipe Factory P.O. Udyog Nagar Agra Mathura Road Agra (Off : kothi Kewal Sahai Belan Ganj Agra)	IS : 458—1971
7.	CM/L-1284853 1984-03-05	-do-	-do-	Manoj Enterprises Plot No. 1. D.B. Gupta Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005	IS : 4760—1979
8.	CM/L-1284954 1984-03-05	-do-	-do-	-do-	IS : 4260—1979
9.	CM/L-1285047 1984-03-05	-do-	-do-	B.S.F. Industries, 5-D/8E Railway Road, N.I.T. Faridabad -121001 (Haryana)	IS : 4760—1979

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
10. CM/L-1285148 1984-0-06	84-03-16	85-03-15	Southern Cylinders Pvt. Ltd, Isnapur Industrial Area, Pasmalar Village Road, Isnapur, P. tacheru Samithi, Medak Distt. (Off : 47 Santosh Nagar, Near Mehdiapatnam, Hyderabad).	IS : 3196—1974	
11. CM/L-1285249 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Kanáyaka Parameshwari Engg Pvt. Ltd, Survey No. 773, Opp Ganesh Mandir, Village Rudraram, Tq. Sangareddy, Distt. Medak (Off : 4-8-757 Gowligudo, Hyderabad 500012)	IS : 3196—1974	
12. CM/L-1285350 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Dessma Engg. P. Ltd, Survey No. 518, Kishtapur Village, Medchal Tq. Ranga Reddy Distt (Office : 1st floor, Block No. C, Room No. 206, Karan Centre, Opp Minerva Theatre, SD. Road, Secunderabad 500003)	IS : 3196—1974	
13. CM/L-1285451 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Balaji Bitumens, Gundlapochampalli, Medchal Taluk, R.R. Distt (Off : 7-3-716 Rashtrapathi Road, Secunderabad)	IS : 1217—1961	
14. CM/L-1285552 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Mittal Steel Limited, Krishnarajapuram Whitefield Road, Bangalore-560048 (Off : 29/2, K.H. Road, Bangalore-560027)	IS : 7887—1975	
15. CM/L-1285653 1984-1-17	-do-	-do-	Steelworth International Pvt Ltd. 44, 3rd Wross, Industrial Suburb II, Tumkur Road, Layout, Yashwantpur, Bangalore-560022 (Off : Kemwell House, 11 Tumkur Road, Yashwantpur, Bangalore-560027)	IS - 804—1967	
16. CM/L-1285754 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	P.S.G. Industrial Institute, Avanashi Road, Peelamedu, Coimbatore-641004	IS : 6595—1980	
17. CM/L-1285855 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Sangir Plastics Pvt Ltd, A-1/2213, 3rd Phase GIDC, Vapi-396195 (Off : 102 Marine Juhu Tara Road Bombay-400049)	IS : 4984—1978	
18. CM/L-1285956 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Bharat Wire Ropes Mfg Co, Oerlikon Ltd Bhandrup, Bombay-400078 (Off : Plot No. 635/1-2-3, Rattan Industries Compound, LBS Marg, Bhandup Sonapur, Opp Advani)	IS : 2266—1977	
19. CM/L-1286049 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Keshari Steels, Industrial Area, No. 1, Agra-Bombay Road, Dewas-455001 (Off : 9/4 Manoram Ganj, Street No. 5, Indore-452001)	IS : 6914—1978	
20. CM/L-1286150 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Indian Spring and General Engg Co, Mahuda More, P.O. Mahuda-826305 Distt Dhanbad (Bihar)	IS : 1135—1973	
21. CM/L-1286251 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Orissa Aluminium Products Ltd, B-34 Industrial Estate, Cuttack	IS : 204 (Pt II)—1978	
22. CM/L-1286352 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Jaiswal Steel Rollings Mills, West Baragaon, National Highway No. 37, Gauhati-781010 (Off : First Floor, Kayal Market, T.R. Phoolkan Road, Gauhati-781001)	IS : 1786—1979	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
23. CM/L-1286453 1284-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	Assam Udyog Company, Mancotta Road, Dibrugarh-786001 (Assam)	IS : 1786—1979	
24. WM/L-1286554 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Kamakhya Udyog, Village Birkuchi, Narangi, Gauhati-781026 (Off : 12 Zoo Road (West), Gauhati-781024)	IS : 4986—1981	
25. CM/L-128665 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Thakurdas Sureka Engg. Corpn. Pvt. Ltd, 10 Thakurdas Surekha Road, Ghusury, Howrah-711107 (Off : 5 Ganesh Chandra Avenue, Calcutta-70001)	IS : 1729—1979	
26. CM/L-1286756 1983-03-06	-do-	-do-	Sangam Dairy, The Guntur District, Milk Producers Co-operative Union Ltd, Vadlamudi-522213, Tenali Taluq, Guntur Distt.	IS : 1547—1968	
27. CM/L-1286857 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Santosh Brothers, MG Marg (Bhoor), Bulandshahra (Off : Civil Lines, Bulundshahr-20300)	IS : 9030—1979	
28. CM/L-1286958 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Bharti Sprayers, 32 Industrial Area, Phagwara (Punjab)	IS : 3652—1982	
29. CM/L-1287051 1984-0 -06	-do-	-do-	Indo German Agricultural Sprayer & Pressing Works, Near Chand Cinema, G.T. Road, Ludhiana (Off : 1 Jawahar Market, Clock Tower, Ludhiana)	IS : 1971—1982	
30. CM/L-1287151 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Jai n Agricultural Corpn, Phagwara Road, Hoshiarpur (Punjab)	IS : 9020—1979	
31. CM/L-1287253 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Plasto Rubber Industries, 21 Chaulpatty Road, Calcutta-700010 (Off : 12/23, South Coolia Road, Calcutta-700010)	IS : 5382—1969	
32. CM/L-1287354 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Chemicals & Insecticides, Ram Nagar, Karanjaha, P.O. Bhainsah, Gorakhpur (Off : Saraf Chamber, Hindi Bazar, Gorakhpur)	IS : 4323—1980	
33. CM/L-1287455 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	G.T.N. Textiles Ltd, Erumathala, Alwaye-683101 (Kerala) (Off : P.B. No. 10 . Alwaye-683101)	IS : 834—1975	
34. CM/L-1287556 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Vijay Foundry & Engineering Works, Station Road, Khurai (Distt Sagar) M.P.	IS : 9020—1979	
35. CM/L-1287657 1984-03-06	-do-	-do-	Super Co-ordinators 94-1-A Sant Nagar, Near Nehru Place, New Delhi-110019	IS : 4246—1978	
36. CM/L-1287758 1984-03-07	-do-	-do-	Janta Agro Industries, Suratgarh Road, Sriganganagar-335001 (Rajasthan)	IS : 920—1979	
37. CM/L-1287859 1984-03-07	-do-	-do-	Janta Engineering Works, G.T. Road, Moga (Punjab)	IS : 9020—1979	
38. CM/L-1287960 1984-03-07	-do-	-do-	Bharat Agricultural Corporation, Majestic Road, Moga (Punjab)	IS : 9020—1979	
39. CM/L-1288053 1984-03-07	-do-	-do-	Bansal Engineering Works Majestic Road, Moga-142001 (Pb)	IS : 9020—1979	
40. CM/L-1288154 1984-03-07	-do-	-do-	Rajasthan Agra Industries, 22/23C, Industrial Estate, Sriganganagar (Off : 153, Tractor Market, Sriganganagar)	IS : 9020—1979	
41. CM/L-1288255 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	The Jay Engg. Works Ltd., Unit: Usha Sewing Machine Works, 183 A, Prince Anwar Shah Road, Calcutta-700068	IS : 1610—1981	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
42. CM/L-1288356 1984-03-08		84-03-16	85-03-15	Malabar Cements Ltd., Walayer Dam P.O. Palghat-678624 (Off : Shobha TSM Complex Building, Railway Station Road, Palghat-678001)	IS : 269—1976
43. CM/L-1288457 1984-03-08		-do-	-do-	Modi Steel Wire Mfg Co., Plot No. 15, Industrial Estate, Madras-6 (Off : 33 Kasturi Ranga Iyengar Road, Madras-600018)	IS : 6003—1970
44. CM/L-1288558 1984-03-08		-do-	-do-	Inter Pharmaceuticals (India) Pvt. Ltd., Ashok Cinema Building, Patna-800001	IS : 1061—1978
45. CM/L-1288659 1984-03-08		-do-	-do-	Indian Commerical Syndicate, 11/2, Chetty Palayam Road, Podanur, Coimbatore-641023 (Off : 66, Venkataswamy Road (West), R.S. Puram, Coimbatore-641002)	IS : 2052—1979
46. CM/L-1288760 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Raj Cylinders & Containers Pvt Ltd, Plot B-2, Site A, Industrial Area, Mathura (Off : 51 Anand Lok, New Delhi-110049)	IS : 3196—1974
47. CM/L-1288861 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Gurshant Motor Pump Pvt. Ltd., I/H/59, BP, NIT, Opposite New Bus Stand, Faridabad-121001 (Haryana)	IS : 996—1979
48. CM/L-1288962 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Super Polyplast Pvt. Ltd., E-56 to E-59, Industrial Area, Unna , (Off : 26/109-B, Pheel Khana, Kanpur-208001)	IS : 4985—1981
49. CM/L-1289055 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Kuchal Udyog, D-44, Industrial Area, Meerut Road, Ghaziabad (UP)	IS : 1239 (Pt. II)-1969
50. CM/L-1289156 1984-03-08		-do-	-do-	Kutty Flush Doors & Furniture Company Pvt. Ltd, Poonamalle High Road, Koyambedu, Madras-600107	IS : 2202 (Pt. D)-1973
51. CM/L-1289257 1984-03-08		-do-	-do-	Gujarat Agro Industries Corpn Ltd., Pesticides Formulation Unit, Near ITI National Highway, No. 8 B Gondal (Distt Rajkot) (Off : Khet Udyog Bhawan, Opp. High Court, Navarang Pura, Ahmedabad)	IS : 8446—1977
52. CM/L-1289358 1984-03-08		-do-	-do-	The Alpha Match Works, 26 B, Simco Colony, Reserve Line, Sivakasi (Tamil Nadu) (Off : 12 A, Chairman Shanmuga Nadar Road, Sivakasi-626123)	IS : 2653—1980
53. CM/L-1289459 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Royal Rubber Works, S.H. Mount P.O., Kottayam-686006 (Kerala)	IS : 1741—1960
54. CM/L-1289560 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Vishkarama Gymnastic, - G-75 Laxmi Ngar, Delhi-110092	IS : 2312—1967
55. CM/L-1289661 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Shakti Industries, 21-4-546, Charmahal, Hyderabad-500264 (Andhra Pradesh)	IS : 5348—1981
56. CM/L-1289762 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Mahavir Cement Works Pvt. Ltd., 12th KM, Stone, Dehat Road, Saharanpur (Off: Oppo- site Govt. Wood Seasoning Plant Ali Ahan- garan, Saharanpur-24700)	IS:269—1976
57. CM/L-1289863 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Gurdev Industries, "Leela", Kaval, Quilon- 691007 (Tamil Nadu)	IS:4148—1967
58. CM/L-1289964 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Mohan Metal Industries, E-13 , Indrapras- tha Industrial Area, Kota	IS:9020—1979
59. CM/L-1290040 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Aquolac Paints, 70 Najafgarh Road, New Delhi-110015	IS:427—1965

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
60. CM/L-1290141 1984-12-17		84-03-16	85-03-15	Globe General Industries, 12/21/1, Kavita Colony, Nangloi, Delhi-110041	IS:3832—1971
61. CM/L-1290242 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Southern Chemical Industries, D. No. 8/558/4, Kali Gardens, Pedakakani Nambur-522508, Guntur Distt. (Andhra Pradesh)	IS:261—1982
62. CM/L-1290343 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Centron Industrial Alliance Ltd., Chikalthan Industrial Area, Aurangabad (MS) (Off: 219, Adhyaru Industrial Estate, New Sun Mill Compound, Lower Parel, Bombay-400013)	IS:10198—1982
63. CM/L-1290444 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Rajasthan Chemicals Corporation, F-43 Marudhar Industrial Area, Bashni, Phase I, Jodhpur-342005 (Off: Churighar Bazar, Jodhpur-342001)	IS:6047—1970
64. CM/L-1290545 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Sushil Agro Services, 5 Kartarpura, Bais Godam, Jaipur-302006	IS:9020—1979
65. CM/L-1290646 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Konkan Cables, Plot No. B-4, Gane Khadoli Industrial Area, Chiplun, (Distt. Ratnagiri)	IS:1554(Pt. I)—1976
66. CM/L-1290747 1984-03-09		-do-	-do-	Finolex Plastics Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 10, Block 'C' Pimpri-Chinchwad Indl. Area, Chinchwad, Pune-411019 (Off: 26/3, Bombay-Pune Road, Pimpri, Pune-411018)	IS:7834 (Pt. VIII)—1975
67. CM/L-1290848 1984-11-17		-do-	-do-	Konkan Cables, Plot No. B-4, Gane Khadoli Industrial Area, Chiplun (Distt. Ratnagiri)	IS:694—1977
68. CM/L-1290949 1984-03-20		-do-	-do-	Nagarjuna Cements Ltd, Mettapalli, Huzur Nagar Tq. Nalgonda Distt. (Off: 1-1-298/A/1 Ashok Nagar, Hyderabad-20)	IS:269—1976
69. CM/L-1291042 1984-12-17		84-04-01	85-03-31	J.R. Fabricators Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 338, Halol Baroda Highway, Near Baska village, Halol-389350 (Distt. Panchmahal) (Off: 3/F, Shree Building, Ranade Road, Dadar, Bombay-400928)	IS:3196—1974
70. CM/L-1291143 1984-03-21		-do-	-do-	Usha Telehoist Ltd., P.O. Chandannagar, Budge Budge Road, 24 Parganas (Off: 3, Chitranjan Avenue, Calcutta-12)	IS:8421—1977
71. CM/L-129124 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Gujarat State Co-operative Marketing Federation Ltd., Narol-Vatva Road, Narol, Ahmedabad (Off: Sahakar Bhawan, Relief Road, Ahmedabad-380001)	IS:8074—1976
72. CM/L-1291345 1984-03-21		-do-	-do-	The Salem District Co-op. Milk Producers' Union Limited, Sithanur, Dhalavalpetty P. O., Salem-636302	IS:1165—1975
73. CM/L-1291446 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Gujarat Agro-Chemical Mfg. Company, 151-153/1 GIDC Industrial Estate, Naroda, Ahmedabad	IS:5277—1978
74. CM/L-1291547 1984-03-21		84-03-16	85-03-15	Spencer Auto Industries Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 132, Sector 24, Faridabad (Haryana)	IS:4246—1978
75. CM/L-1291648 1984-12-17		84-04-01	85-03-31	Sudershan Plywood Industries P. Ltd., A. T. Road, Margherita Dibrugarh, Assam (Off: 4 Fairline Place, Calcutta-700001)	IS:1328—1982

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
76. CM/L-1291749 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	Victor Cable Corporation, 185, G. T. Road, Sahibabad (U. P.)	IS: 694-1977	
77. CM/L-1291850 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Shree Digvijay Cement Company, (Asbestos Products Division), Digvijay nagar, Ahmedabad-382470	IS: 459-1970	
78. CM/L-1291951 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Usha Cement ; Chemicals Private Limited, Siddling Road, NR Railway Crossing, Upleta-360490	IS: 269-1976	
79. CM/L-1292044 1984-03-21	—do—	—do—	Kamani Engg. Corpn. Ltd., Nari Road, Bhavnagar-364006	IS : 6914-1978	
80. CM/L-1292145 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Moti Electric Industries P. Ltd., Plot No. 6, MIDC Industrial Area, Hingana Road, Nagpur	IS: 398 (Pt.)-1976	
81. CM/L-1292246 1984-03-21	—do—	—do—	Solar Syndicate, Dungri-396375 Distt Bulsar, Gujarat-State	IS: 8029-1976	
82. CM/L-1292347 1984-03-21	—do—	—do—	Agro Equipments (India), Plot No. 88, Sector 24, Faridabad (Haryana) (Off: Ho 7868, Roshanara Road, Delhi-110007	IS: 4760-1979	
83. CM/L-1292448 1984-03-21	—do—	—do—	Northern Minerals Pvt Ltd., Daulatabad Road, Gurgaon (Haryana) (Off: 10-A, Rajendra Mansion, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002	IS: 8960-1978	
84. CM/L-1292549 1984-03-21	—do—	—do—	Silver Flame Appliances, 60/11, DLF Industrial Area I, Faridabad 121003 (Haryana)	IS: 4760-1979	
85. CM/L-1292650 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Marathwada Insecticides, Plot No: 27, Industrial Area, Chikalthana Aurangabad (Off : Kiran Bangalow, New Osmanpur, Aurangabad)	IS: 2567-1978	
86. CM/L-1292751 1984-03-21	—do—	—do—	Gujarat Insecticides Ltd, Plot No. 805/806 GIDC Industrial Estate, P. B. No. 90, Ankleswar-393002 (Off: Khet Udyog Bhawan, Opp High Court, Ahmedabad)	IS: 8445-1977	
87. CM/L-1292852 1984-03-21	—do—	—do—	P. Ram Chand & Co., Basti Nau, Jalandhar-144002 (Punjab)	IS: 417 (Pt. I) 1974	
88. CM/L-1292953 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Supreme Electrical Industries, 58/2, Subramanyapura Road, Bangalore-560061	IS: 365-1965	
89. CM/L-1293046 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Alcost India Corpn, 127, Industrial Estate, Silvassa-396230, Dadra & Nagar Haveli	IS: 398 (Pt II)-1976	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
90. CM/L-1293147 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	Associated Cement Co. Limited, Porbandar Cement Works, Old Ministry Grounds, Aerodrome Road, P. O. Porbandar-360575 (W. Railway) Gujarat	IS: 269-1976	
91. CM/L-1293248 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Spun Casting & Engg. Co. Pvt. Ltd., 77/5, Benaras Road, Howrah (Off: 20 Mullick Street, Calcutta-700007)	IS: 7181-1974	
92. CM/L-1293349 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Aleest India Corpn. (Shree Taparia Beneficiary Trust) 127, Industrial Estate, Silvassa-396230, Dadra & Nagar Haveli	IS: 398 (Pt I)-1976	
93. CM/L-1293450 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Kamani Engg. Corpn. Ltd, Nari Road, Bhavnagar-364006	IS: 6915-1978	
94. CM/L-1293551 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Gujarat Steel Tubes Ltd, Kali, Near Sabarmati, Ahmedabad-382470	IS: 9295-1979	
95. CM/L-1293652 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	J. K. Steel, P. O. Rishra, Distt Hooghly (W. B.) (Off: 7 Council House Street, Calcutta-700054)	IS: 1786-1979	
96. CM/L-1293753 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Ambika Iron & Steel Works and Re-rolling Mills, Saijpur Bhogha, Near G. D. High School, Ahmedabad-382345	IS: 1786-1979	
97. CM/L-1293854 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Electromine, 25 25, Chanditala Branch Road, Calcutta-700053	IS: 2148-1968	
98. CM/L-1293955 1984-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	Silmaris International, Building No. XI/316 Thrikkakara South Padamugam Road, Thrikkakara-21 (Off: 42/520, Power House Road, P. B. No. 1941, Cochin-682018)	IS: 10 (Pt IV)-1976	
99. CM/L-1294048 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Jayshree Timber Industries, Gopalpara Town, P.O. Baladmari, Distt. Gopalpara (Assam)	IS : 10(Pt II)-1976	
100. CM/L-1294149 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	International Plastics & Pipes Pvt. Ltd. 503-A, GIDC Industrial Area, Baroda-Dodhra Main Road, Halol, Distt Panchmahal Gujarat (Off : A Subhas Road, Vile-Parle (East) Bombay-400057)	IS : 4985-1981	
101. CM/L-1294250 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	D.P. Garg & Company, B-3, Sector 3, Noida Complex, Distt Ghaziabad (U.P.)	IS : 362-1982	
102. CM/L-1294351 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Himalaya Rubber Products Ltd, Kalyani Industrial Estate, Plot No. 24, Block D, P.O. Kalyani, Distt Nadia (WB) (Off : PNB House, Annexe; 18 B, Brabourne Road, Calcutta-700001)	IS : 2494-1974	
103. CM/L-1294452 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Andhra Cement Co Ltd. Durga Cement Works, Durgapuram Dachepalli Post, Guntur Distt.	IS : 455-1976	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
104. CM/L-1294553 1984-12-17		84-04-01	85-03-31	Jay Shree Wood Products, P.O. Rupai Siding, Doom Dooma, Distt. Dibrugarh (Assam)	IS : 10(Pt II)-1976
105. CM/L-1294654 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Moti Electric Industries Pvt Ltd, Plot No. 6, MIDC Industrial Area, Hingana Road, Nagpur,	IS : 398 (Pt II)-1976
106. CM/L-1294755 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Viramgam Rolling Mills (P) Limited, Udyognagar, Viramgam-382150	IS : 1786-1979
107. CM/L-1294856 1984-03-22		-do-	-do-	Salvakumar Knittings, 7-A/12, Nanjappa High School Road, Tirupur-638601 (TN)	IS : 4964-1980
108. CM/L-1294957 1984-03-22		-do-	-do-	Harbanslal Malhotra & Sons, 40 Belur Station Road, P.O. Belurmah, Howrah 711202 (West Bengal)	IS : 10198-1982
109. CM/L-1295050 1984-03-22		-do-	-do-	The Silk Hosiery Mills, 18, SIDCO Industrial Estate, Harvey Road, Tirupur-638602 (TN)	IS : 4964-1980
110. CM/L-1295151 1984-03-22		-do-	-do-	Peekay Mills, 90-H(4) Kamaraj Road, Tirupur-638604 (TN)	IS : 4964-1980
111. CM/L-1295252 1984-03-22		-do-	-do-	Shipman Hosieries, P.D. Appachinagar, 3rd Street, Kongunagar Main Road, Tirupur-638607 (TN)	IS : 4964-1980
112. CM/L-1295353 1984-03-22		-do-	-do-	Model Knitting Company, 1 (2), Alangadu, Karuvampalayam, Tirupur -638604 (TN)	IS : 4964-1980
113. CM/L-1295454 1984-03-22		-do-	-do-	Gediri Textiles, 16, Municipal Colony, Karuvampalayam, Tirupur-638604 (TN)	IS : 4964-1980
114. CM/L-1295555 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Kantilal Chunni Lal & Sons Appliances Pvt Ltd, 3 Jawahar Road, Udyognagar, Udhana-394210 (Gujarat)	IS : 4159-1976
115. CM/L-1295656 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Sashi Timber & Plywood Industries Pvt Ltd, P.O. Ethalbari, Distt Jalpaiguri (North Bengal) Off : 33/1, Netaji Subhash Road, Calcutta-700001	IS : 10 (Pt II)-1976
116. CM/L-1295757 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Saini Industrial Corporation, 54-B, Industrial Area, Jhotwara, Jaipur-302012	IS : 774-1971
117. CM/L-1295858 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Shree Hari Wires, 321 Jain Temple Gali, Swaminarayan Industrial Estate, Vastadevdi Road, Surat	IS : 694-1977
118. CM/L-1295959 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Tamilnadu Steels, (A Unit of Tamilnadu Industrial Development Corporation Ltd), Ekhunagar, Arakonam-631004	IS : 226-1975
119. CM/L-1296052 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Sefex Fire Services, 202 'A' Dhanraj Industrial Estate, Sun Mill Road, Lower Parel, (West), Bombay-400013	IS : 2878-1976
120. CM/L-1296153 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	G.K. Steels & Industries, Mettupalayam Road, K. Vadamadurai P.O. Coimbatore-641017	IS : 226-1975
121. CM/L-1296254 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Bengal Hammer Industries Pvt. Ltd, 58/1 Malipanchgara Street (Kali Mazumdar Road) P.O. Ghusuri, Howrah (Off : 135 Girish Ghish Road, Plot No. 35 D, P.O. Belurmah, Howrah)	IS : 1786-1979
122. CM/L-1296355 1984-12-17		-do-	-do-	Blue Star Electroplaters, "Blue Star Building" 3 Bhaktinagar Station Plot, Rajkor-360002	IS : 6750-1972

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
123. CM/L-1296456 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	JaiKisan Manufacturing Corporation, Tanti Road, 4 Mavdi Plot, Rajkot-360004	IS : 10001-1981	
124. CM/L-1296557 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	National Re-rolling Mills, Bawasteel Building, Opp. Railway Station, Kamptee-441001 Distt Nagpur (Off : 88 Canal Road, Ramdaspath, Nagpur-440010)	IS : 226-1975	
125. CM/L-1296658 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Apex Stainless Steel & Non-ferrous Alloys Steel (P) Ltd, 6th Mile, Hosur Road, Modivala Post, Bangalore-560068 (Off : No. 28, 'F' Block, 1st Floor, Balaji Complex, Sultanpet, Bangalore-560053)	IS : 1186-1979	
126. CM/L-1296759 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Guest Keen Williams Ltd, 97 Andul Road, Howrah-711101	IS : 1148-1973	
127. CM/L-1296860 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	-do-	IS : 1977-1975	
128. CM/L-1296961 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	-do-	IS : 226-1975	
129. CM/L-1297054 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Gujarat Steel Tubes Ltd, Kahi Near Sabarmati, Ahmedabad-382470	IS : 1978-1971	
130. CM/L-1297155 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Safex Fire Services, 202 A, Dhanraj Industrial Estate, Sun Mill Road, Lower Parel (W), Bombay-400013	IS : 5490 (Pt I)-1977	
131. CM/L-1297256 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Utkal Pesticides & Chemicals, P.O. Jagannathpur Distt. Ganjam (Orissa) (Off : Station Road, Berhampur-760005)	IS : 1307-1982	
132. CM/L-1297357 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Madan Electric Co Pvt Ltd, CIB/2402-2403, GIDC Phase III, Vapi-396195 Distt Valsad	IS : 325-1978	
133. CM/L-1297458 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Shrivani Steel Tubes Ltd, 16th K.M. Stone, Bangalore Whitefield Road, Bangalore-560048 (Off : Pushpak P.B. No. 2556, No. 2/4 1st Floor, Ashlay Park, Off Brunton Road, Bangalore-560025)	IS : 3601-1966	
134. CM/L-1297559 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Azad Engineering Works, Bibi Wala Road, Bhatinda-151001	IS : 10001-1981	
135. CM/L-1297660 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Movilex Plastics Pvt Ltd, Gate No. 41, Kusgaon, Taluka: Bhor, Distt Poona (Off : Hira House, 381, S.V.P. Road, Bombay-400004)	IS : 4985-1981	
136. CM/L-1297761 1984-12-17	84-03-16	85-03-15	M.G. Shapi & Co (Delhi) Pvt Ltd, 12/1 Mile, Mathura Road, Faridabad-121003 (Off : 34-B, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001)	IS : 220-1972	
137. CM/L-1297862 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Punjab Krishi Udyog, Near Bus Stand, Damoh (MP)	IS : 9020-1979	
138. CM/L-1297963 1984-03-21	84-04-01	85-03-31	Lotus Pesticides Post, Sadri, Station Falna, Distt Pali (Rajasthan)	IS : 8291-1976	
139. CM/L-1298056 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	ATDA, Mini Cement Project, Mohanlal Ganj, Lucknow (UP)	IS : 269-1976	
140. CM/L-1298157 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Gupta Rubber Industries, Industrial Estate, Delhi Road, Saharanpur-247001	IS : 1891 (Pt I)-1978	
141. CM/L-1298258 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Vidarbha Steel Rolling Mills, 134-135 Small Industrial Area, Bhandara Road, Nagpur-440008	IS : 226-1975	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
142. CM/L-1298359 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	Bhangar Enterprises, 211, G.I.D.C. Indl. Estate, Umargam Distt. Valsad	IS : 7538-1975	
143. CM/L-1298460 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Aman Engineering Works, 84 Aman Nagar, Industrial Area, Jalandhar-144004	IS : 779-1978	
144. CM/L-1298561 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	En En Corporation, C-17, Industrial Focal Point, Jalandhar	IS : 1879 (Pt I, II, III, VI & X)-1975	
145. CM/L-1298662 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	K.P. Mondal & Sons, 68/69, Panchantala Road, Howrah-711101 (Off : 206/1, Panchantala Road, Howrah-711101)	IS : 780-1980	
146. CM/L-1298763 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	S.S.F. Industries, 152 Avanashi Road, Peelamedu P.O. Coimbatore-641004	IS : 7538-1975	
147. CM/L-1298864 1984-03-23	-do-	-do-	Bhagyalakshmi Knittings, 8 Pitchama-palayam Lane, Tirupur-638602	IS : 4964-1980	
148. CM/L-1298965 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Northern Minerals Pvt. Ltd., Daultabad Road, Gurgaon (Haryana) (Off: 19-A, Rajindra Mansion, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002)	IS: 2865-1978	
149. CM/L-1299058 1984-03-23	-do-	-do-	Aquolac paints, 70 Najafgarh Road, New Delhi-110015	IS: 168-1973	
150. CM/L-1299159 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Uma Industries, 12 Ammankulam Road, Pappanickenpalayam, Coimbatore-641037	IS: 7538-1975	
151. CM/L-1299260 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	West Coast Iron & Steels, Thottada, Cannanore	IS: 226-1975	
152. CM/L-1299361 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Ganesh Oil Engines, 17 Bhaktinagar Station, Plot Rajkot-360002	IS: 10001-1981	
153. CM/L-1299462 1984-03-23	-do-	-do-	J. K. Jute Mills Co. Ltd. Kalpi Road, Fuzal Ganj, Kanpur.	IS: 2566-1965	
154. CM/L-1299563 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Padma Bhushan Forgings, C-30, Focal Point, Jalandhar City-144004	IS: 778-1980	
155. CM/L-1299664 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Shree Digvijay Cement Company Limited, Digvijay Nagar, Ahmedabad-382470	IS: 1592-1980	
156. CM/L-1299765 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Diana Casements, 100 Nelson Manicks, Mudaliar Road, Aminjkarai, Madras-29	IS: 6248-1979	
157. CM/L-1299866 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	Shree Ram Steel Rolling Mills, Kolshet Road, Near Power House, Thana (Off: Potia Industrial Estate, Above Union Weigh Bridge, Darukhana, Bombay-400010)	IS: 226-1975	
158. CM/L-1299967 1984-03-23	84-03-16	85-03-15	A. C. C. Ltd. (Gayal Cement Works), P. O. Barmana-174013 Distt Bilaspur (H. P.)	IS: 1489-1986	
159. CM/L-1300017 1984-12-17	-do-	-do-	-do-	IS: 269-1976	
160. CM/L-1300118 1984-03-23	1984-04-01	85-03-31	LVR Foods & Minerals Pvt. Ltd. 29 Cochrane, Basin Road, Madras-21 (Off: 2 Thatthemuthiappan Street, Madras-600001)	IS: 2052-1979	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
161.	CM/L-1300219 1984-12-17	84-04-41	85-03-31	Jha Industries, Jhansi Shivpuri Road, Koreia (Distt Shivpuri)	IS: 9020-1979
162.	CM/L-1300320 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Ashoka Foundry & Engg. Works, G. T. Road, Shahbad, Markanda-132135 (Haryana)	IS: 9020-1979
163.	CM/L-1300421 1983-03-23	—do—	—do—	Khaitan Sidco Ltd, Khorobar, Dauria Road, Gorakhpur (UP)	IS: 1011-1981
164.	CM/L-1300522 1984-03-23	—do—	—do—	Jain Industrial Manufacturing Co., Plot No. 160, Udyog Vihar, Phase I HS/DC Industrial Complex, Dundarhera Gurgaon-122016 (Haryana)	IS: 4246-1978
165.	CM/L-1300623 1984-12-17	84-04-16	85-04-15	Parkash Engineering Enterprises, A-193 Peenya Industrial Estate, Bangalore-560058	IS: 9301-1982
166.	CM/L-1300724 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Ess Ess Enterprises, Village Bad Majra P. O. Dabh Tehsil, Kharar (Ropar) (Off: H. No. 52, Phase IV Mohali)	IS: 458-1971
167.	CM/L-1300325 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Vishwas Oil Engines, 1243/86-87 Shivaji Udyamnagar, Kolhapur-416008	IS: 10001-1981
168.	CM/L-1300926 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Popular Cable Industries, Plot No. 119, Road No. 18, MIDC Andheri (E), Bombay-400093	IS: 694-1977
169.	CM/L-1301019 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Jai Electronic Industries, Pvt. Ltd., 74, Industrial Area, Satpur, Nasik-422007	IS: 4480-(Pt I)-1967
170.	CM/L-1301120 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Jindal (India) limited, 4 Dharamtalla Road, Belurmath, Howrah (Off: 2/1 Ahmed Mamuji Street, Liliah, Howrah-711204)	IS: 3589-1981
171.	CM/L-1301221 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Kumlay Vable Industries, Jeagaon Frontier Check Post, Distt Jalpaiguri, West Bengal	IS: 694-1977
172.	CM/L-1301322 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Crushmore Maxban India, P-271 Benaras Road, Howrah-711108	IS: 3832-1971
173.	CM/L-1301423 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Goel Steel Industries, 57 Malipanchagara Road, Liliah, Howrah (Off: 207 Maharsi Debendra Road, Calcutta-700070)	IS: 1786-1979
174.	CM/L-1301524 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Aurkay Wood Crafts, Udayrajpur, Jessore Road, 24 Parganas (Off: 14th Netaji Subhash Road, 1st Floor, Calcutta-700001)	IS: 10 (Pt II)-1976
175.	CM/L-1301625 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Bharat Agro Industries, 8 Mavdi Plot, Rajkot-360004	IS: 10001-1981
176.	CM/L-1301726 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Mathandira Electricals, Kamla Mission Road, Nadiad (W. Rly) Gujarat	IS: 9857-1981

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
177.	CM/L-1301827 1984-12-17	84-04-16	85-04-15	Mukesh Metal Box Co, Mavdi Plot, Rajkot-360004	IS: 10325-1982
178.	CM/L-1301928 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Ashok Metal Industries, Mavdi Plot, Rajkot-360002 (Off: Tagore Road, Rajkot-360002) (Gujarat)	IS: 10325-1982
179.	CM/L-1302021 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Ashok Iron & Steel Fabricators, Mavdi Plot, Rajkot-360004	IS: 10325-1982
180.	CM/L-1302122 1984-12-17	84-04-01	85-03-31	Guru Nanak Agricultural Industries, G.T. Road, Khurja-203131	IS: 9020-1979
181.	CM/L-1302223 1984-03-28	84-04-16	85-04-15	The Eastern Manufacturing Co Ltd, 1, Ali Hyder Road, P.O. Titagarh, Distt. 24 Parganas (WB)	IS: 2818 (Pt II)-1971
182.	CM/L-1302324 1984-03-28	—do—	—do—	Shree Hanuman Jute & Laminating Industries 40/2 'A' Road, Bangachhi Salkia Howrah (WB) (Off: 12-B, Russel Street, Calcutta-700071)	IS: 7406 (Pt II)-1980
183.	CM/L-1302425 1984-03-28	—do—	—do—	—do—	IS: 7406 (Pt I)-19974
184.	CM/L-1302526 1984-12-17	—do—	—do—	Padgilwar Electrical Industries, Manufacturers of Agriculture Machinery, Mangaldas Market, Akola-444001 (Maharashtra)	IS: 9020-1979
185.	CM/L-1302627 1984-03-28	—do—	—do—	Kilpest Industries, Saravali Dahanu Road, Distt; Thana (Off: H 2-10 Bangur Nagar, M.G. Road, Goregaon, Bombay-400090)	IS: 4323-1980
186.	CM/L-1302728 1984-03-29	—do—	—do—	Kohinoor Paints (P) Ltd, Near Railway Station, Chheharta-143105 (Amritsar) (Off: 13 R. B. Rattan Chand Road, The Mall, Amritsar-143001)	IS: 5410-1969
187.	CM/L-1302829 1984-03-29	—do—	—do—	Newage Appliances (P) Ltd, Plot No. 257, Sector 24, Faridabad-121005 (Haryana)	IS: 4760-1979
188.	CM/L-1302930 1984-03-29	—do—	—do—	Vanaz Engineers (P) Ltd, 396 Vee Saverkar Marg, Prabhadevi, Bombay-400025	IS: 9798-1981






[No. CMD/13 : 11]

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1986

का.आ. 3977.—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम, 1955 के विनियम (4) के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिमूर्चित किया जाता है कि जिन मानक चिह्नों के डिजाइन उनके शाब्दिक विवरण तथा तत्सम्बन्धी भारतीय मानक के शीर्षक सहित उनके अनुमोचों में दिए गए हैं वे निर्धारित कर दिए गए हैं।

भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) अधिनियम, 1952 और इसके अधीन बने नियमों तथा विनियमों के निर्मित या मानक चिह्न उनके मामले की गई तारीखों से लागू होंगे :

संयुक्त

क्रम संख्या	मानक चिह्न का डिजाइन	उत्पाद/उत्पाद की श्रेणी	सम्बंधी भारतीय मानक की संख्या और शीर्षक	मानक चिह्न के डिजाइन का शब्दिक विवरण	लागू होने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.		एक-मार्क वाली आयतनी प्लाश्क	IS : 915-1975 एक-मार्क वाली आयतनी प्लाश्कों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें स्तम्भ (2) में दिखाई गई निश्चित शैली और परस्पर सम्बद्ध अनुपात में "ISI" अक्षर बनाए गए हैं, भारतीय मानक की संख्या डिजाइन में दिखाए अनुसार मोनोग्राम के ऊपर अंकित है।	1985-12-01
2.		बरेलू कार्यों के लिए हाथ और पैर चालित मिलाई की मशीनें	IS : 1610-1981 बरेलू कार्यों के लिए मिलाई की मशीनों की सामान्य अपेक्षाओं की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें स्तम्भ (2) में दिखाई गई निश्चित शैली और परस्पर सम्बद्ध में अनुपात में "ISI" अक्षर बनाए गए हैं, भारतीय मानक की संख्या डिजाइन में दिखाए अनुसार मोनोग्राम के ऊपर अंकित है।	1983-12-16
3.		रेल गाड़ी में प्रकाश करने के पट्टे	IS : 6583-1972 रेल गाड़ी में प्रकाश करने के पट्टों की विशिष्टि	"	1984-01-01
4.		मिथाइलब्रोमाइड गैस के लिए बेल्डित अल्प कार्बन इस्पात के गैस सिलिंडर	IS : 7682-1975 मिथाइल ब्रोमाइड गैस के लिए बेल्डित अल्प कार्बन इस्पात के गैस सिलिंडरों की विशिष्टि	"	1985-03-01
5.		धान के छिलके उतारने की मशीन के रबड़ के रोल	IS : 8427-1977 धान के छिलके उतारने की मशीन के रबड़ के रोल की विशिष्टि	"	1985-07-16

[सं. सीएमडी/13. 9]

बी. एन. सिंह,
अपर महा निदेशक






New Delhi, the 7th November, 1986

S.O. 3977.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955 the Indian Standards Institution, hereby notifies that the Standard Mark(s), design(s) of which together with the verbal description of the design(s) and the title(s) of

the relevant Indian Standard(s) are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been specified.

These Standard Mark(s) for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from the dates shown against each :

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of the Relevant Indian standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark	Date of Effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.		One-mark volumetric flasks	IS: 915-1975 Specification for one-mark volumetric flasks (first revision)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI' drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2); the number of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.	1985-12-01
2.		Sewing Machines for household purposes hand and foot operated	IS: 1610-1981 Specification for general requirements for sewing machines for household purposes (first revision)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI' drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2); the number of the Indian standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.	1983-11-16
3.		Train lighting bolting	IS: 6583-1972 Specification for train lighting bolting	—do—	1984-01-01
4.		Welded low carbon steel gas cylinders for methyl bromide gas	IS: 7583-1975 specification for welded low carbon steel gas cylinders for methyl bromide gas	—do—	1985-03-01
5.		Rubber roll for paddy dehusker	IS: 8417-1977 Specification for rubber roll for paddy de-huskar	—do—	1985-07-16

[N. CMD/13 : 9]

B. N. SINGH, Addl. Director General

संचार मंत्रालय
(दूरसंचार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 17 नवम्बर, 1986

का.प्रा. 3978:—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627 दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गये भारतीय तार नियम 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार महानिदेशक, दूरसंचार विभाग ने करण पुरम, अलगुसमुद्रम तथा पिच्चमकोट्टे टेलीफोन केन्द्रों, तमिलनाडु सर्किल, में दिनांक 01-12-1986 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं 5-26/86-मं.एच.बी.]

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(Department of Telecommunications)

New Delhi, the 11th November, 1986

S.O. 3978.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director

1117 GI/86—9

General, Department of Telecommunications, hereby specifies 01-12-1986 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Krishnapuram, Alagusamudram and Thirumakottai Telephone Exchanges, Tamil Nadu Telecom. Circle.

[No. 5-26/86-PHB]

का.प्रा. 3979:—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गये भारतीय तार नियम 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार महानिदेशक, दूरसंचार विभाग ने पेरुंगुलम टेलीफोन केन्द्र, तमिलनाडु सर्किल में दिनांक 30-11-1986 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[संख्या 5-33/86-मं.एच.बी.]

के.पी. शर्मा, सहायक महानिदेशक

(पी.एच.बी.)

S.O. 3979.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Department of Telecommunications, hereby specifies 30-11-1986 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Perungulam Telephone Exchanges, Tamil Nadu Circle.

[No. 5-33/86-PHB]

K. P. SHARMA, Asstt. Director General (PHB)

अन्य दस्तावेज

नई दिल्ली, 12 नवंबर, 1986

का.प्र. 3980:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, इंडियन आयरन एंड स्टील कं. लि. की चासनाला कोलियरी के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. 2, धनबाद के पंजाब को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 4-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ है।

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 12th November, 1986

S.O. 3980.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chasnalla Colliery of M/s. Indian Iron & Steel Company Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 56 of 1986

In the matter of industrial disputes under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Chasnalla Colliery of M/s Indian Iron & Steel Company Limited and their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workmen—Shri J. P. Singh, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 23rd October, 1986

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/228/85-D. III(A), dated, the 20th January, 1986.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Chasnalla Colliery of the Indian Iron & Steel Company Limited P.O. Chasnalla Dhanbad in dismissing the workman Shri Anutosh Roy Choudhary, Store Keeper, is justified? If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

The case of the management is that the concerned workman Shri Anutosh Roy Choudhary was working as a Store Keeper in Chasnalla Colliery of M/s IISCO. A serious act of misconduct on the part of the concerned workman came to the notice of the management and thereafter he was issued with a charge sheet dated 27th December, 1983. It was alleged that on 20th September, 1982 the concerned workman while on duty was given a sum of Rs. 4000 for payment of railway freight, wharfage etc. in connection with railway consignment for Chasnalla Colliery from Patherdih Railway Station. It is further alleged that the concerned workman

produced Railway Receipt No. 504056 for Rs. 823 and Railway Receipt No. 304033 for Rs. 1630 both dated 20th September, 1982 of Patherdih Railway Station and thus showing total expenditure of Rs. 2453 out of Rs. 4000 advanced to him and he returned the balance amount of Rs. 1547 to the management. A suspicion arose in respect of Railway receipt No. 304033 dated 20th September, 1982 in respect of Rs. 1630 and thereafter an enquiry was made with Patherdih Railway Station and it was detected that the actual payment made towards the said receipt was Rs. 630 only and the amount of Rs. 630 in the said Railway Receipt was tampered to indicate an amount of Rs. 1630. The management alleged that the concerned workman had misappropriated company's money of Rs. 1000 by way of forging/tampering the original railway receipt No. 304033 dated 20th September, 1982 of Patherdih Railway Station and tried to cheat fraudulently company's money by not depositing the residual amount in favour of the company immediately after the said work of the company at Patherdih Railway Station was completed. The concerned workman was therefore charged under Clause 18(1)(a) and 18(1)(v) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Chasnalla Colliery applicable to the concerned workman. The concerned workman submitted his reply to the chargesheet admitting the charge and requesting that he may be excused for this time. Although there was an admission of the charge by the concerned workman the management ordered for holding a domestic enquiry against the concerned workman into the charges framed against him. Shri M. Mukherjee the then Dy. Manager Personnel was appointed as an Officer to hold the enquiry against the concerned workman. After due notice being served on the concerned workman, the enquiry officer held the enquiry into the charges against the concerned workman. The concerned workman fully participated in the enquiry. The management's witnesses were examined in presence of the concerned workman and he was given full opportunity to cross-examine the management's witnesses and to defend himself in the enquiry. The concerned workman was also given an opportunity to make his own statement. The concerned workman did not examine any witness in his defence. The enquiry officer submitted his enquiry report holding the concerned workman guilty of the charge framed against him. The Chief Mining Engineer after having considered the report of the enquiry officer, the proceeding of the enquiry and gravity of the misconduct proved against the concerned workman came to the conclusion that it was a fit case for dismissal of the concerned workman. Accordingly the concerned workman was dismissed from service by letter dated 17th July, 1984 with immediate effect. A domestic enquiry was held in accordance with the principles of natural justice and all possible opportunities were given to the workman to defend his case.

The plea of the concerned workman that he was in great domestic trouble because of the sickness of his widow mother who was on the death bed and that the concerned workman was not in his full sense could not be accepted by the management. According to the management the act of misconduct committed by the concerned workman was deliberate and it cannot be said that it was a case of mistake or oversight. The alleged sickness of the mother of the concerned workman cannot be a ground for committing forgery, fraud and dishonesty. The management had never given any assurance to the concerned workman that the enquiry was a mere formal affair and that the concerned workman need not cross-examine the management's witness as he would be let off from the charges levelled against him. On the above plea it is submitted on behalf of the management that the dismissal of the concerned workman was justified and that he is not entitled to any relief.

The case of the workmen is that the concerned workman was given amount of Rs. 4000 for payment of Railway Freight etc. on 20th September, 1982 in connection with collection of Railway consignment from Patherdih Railway Station. After receiving the consignment the concerned workman produced railway receipts No. 304056 for Rs. 823 and 304033 for Rs. 1630. The total spent was for Rs. 2453 leaving a balance of Rs. 1547 out of 4000. The concerned workman that accounted for Rs. 2453 and returned the balance amount of Rs. 1547.00. On verification from Patherdih Railway Station it was detected that in respect of receipt No. 304033 dated 20th September, 1982 the actual payment made was Rs. 630 instead of Rs. 1630. According to the management

the concerned workman had tempered in the railway receipt so that the amount of Rs. 630 was raised to Rs. 1630 and thus the concerned workman got an illicit gain of Rs. 1000. It is submitted that during the said transaction the concerned workman was in great domestic trouble as his widow mother was on the death bed due to which he was in great difficulty and mental agony. But even then he was managing his duties anyhow. The release of consignment from the railway station was not the normal function of the concerned workman and the said work was done by Shri S. Bhattacharjee Sr. Store Keeper and Shri N. K. Singh, Assistant Store Keeper and he had to attend Patherdih Station on 20th September, 1982 because of their absence. When the concerned workman went to Patherdih Railway Station to take the delivery of the consignment the cash receipt of the two consignments were issued by the Goods Clerk of Patherdih Railway Station. One receipt was for Rs. 823 and the other receipt was for Rs. 1630. The concerned workman had no reason to suspect any foul play in the receipt in respect of Rs. 1630, he paid the money to the goods clerk on the basis of the amount mentioned in the two railway receipts and accounted for the same in his office on its basis and returned the balance of Rs. 1547 to the office on 21st September, 1982. Subsequently Shri M. S. Siddique who was Manager Stores, Shri F. A. Khan, General Assistant Stores, Shri S. Bhattacharjee Sr. Store Keeper and Shri N. K. Singh, Asstt. Store Keeper told him that there was difference in the amount of railway money receipt No. 304033 as the receipt maintained in Patherdih Railway Station was for Rs. 630 only whereas the concerned workman had submitted the receipt for Rs. 1630. It is stated that they were convinced that the goods clerk may have made interpolation both in figures as well as in words in the receipts issued to the concerned workman in order to grab the amount of Rs. 1000 and at the same time keeping the record of the Railway straight by keeping the original receipt showing receipt of Rs. 630. It was thought that it was not possible to recover the amount from the goods clerk and there was further risk of the Railway authorities instituting a criminal case against the concerned workman for levelling false charge and for tampering the railway receipt and hence the best course was that the concerned workman should deposit the amount of Rs. 1000 in order to avoid any loss to the company. Although the concerned workman had no money at that time, he colleagues arranged to collect the amount of Rs. 1000 and the same was deposited in the office account on 10th November, 1982. The colliery authorities informed the headquarters about the incident. A serious notice was taken by the headquarters. A vigilance enquiry was made subsequently on the report of the vigilance officer a chargesheet was issued against the concerned workman to thrash out the matter in the domestic enquiry. The colleague of the concerned workman advised him not to involve any railway official as the colliery had regular work at Patherdih Railway Station. The concerned workman was assured that the domestic enquiry was simply intended to keep the record straight and it was a mere formality. On the above assurance the concerned workman did not cross-examine any management's witnesses and he made his statement as desired by his colleagues and the enquiry officer. The enquiry officer found the concerned workman guilty of the charge and he was subsequently dismissed from service. No fair deal had been given to the concerned workman by the management and the enquiry officer. The charge against the concerned workman was not proved in the enquiry. The Witnesses and the enquiry officer were misled by the so-called confession on the part of the concerned workman. It is further stated that the story of confession being not the part of the chargesheet, the evidence led in the matter of confession is illegal and cannot be the basis of awarding punishment to the concerned workman. On the above plea it is submitted that the concerned workman is innocent and is a victim of the circumstances and malice on the part of the witnesses, the enquiry officer and the higher management. It is prayed that the concerned workman be reinstated in his original job with continuity of service, full back wages and other emolument admissible to him.

The management at the outset prayed that as it is a case of dismissal of the concerned workman after holding domestic enquiry into the charges against him it first be decided as a preliminary issue whether the enquiry proceedings was fair, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice in as much as the workmen have challenged the fairness and the propriety of the domestic enquiry. Accordingly the

fairness and the propriety of the domestic enquiry was first taken up for hearing as a preliminary issue in which the management examined the enquiry officer. By the order dated 12th September, 1986 this Tribunal held that the enquiry against the concerned workman was fair and proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. In effect this reference was used for hearing on merit on the materials which were already on the record of the enquiry.

The only question to be decided in this case is whether the charge against the concerned workman has been established. The management examined F. A. Khan, General Assistant Stores, Shri S. Bhattacharjee, Store Keeper Central Stores, Chasnalla, A. K. Banerjee, Vigilance Inspector and S. N. Singh, Goods Clerk, Patherdih Railway Station besides the management's representative Shri M. S. Siddique, Dy. Manager, Stores, before the enquiry officer. The management also produced documents which were marked Ex. No. 1 to 14 by the Enquiry officer.

The chargesheet dated 27th December, 1983 against the concerned workman is Ex. M-2 in which the details of the allegations are stated. Ex. M-3 dated 5th January, 1984 is the reply of the concerned workman to the chargesheet. The concerned workman has stated in his reply to the chargesheet that he had already submitted the duplicate receipt and returned all the money balance amount against the advance made by him on 20th September, 1982. He has further stated that during the said period his mind was becoming not fast due to his prolonged mother and for the same reason the concerned workman was vegetatively upset and did not his mind. Further, all the time he stated that if any error or omission occurred due to above facts he requested to be excused and that was the assurance that all these things shall not be any such repetition. This document and the concerned workman was accepting the allegation and as such he begged for being excused. Ex. M-1 dated 12th January, 1984 shows that the management being not satisfied with the reply of the concerned workman, a domestic enquiry also the chargesheet was issued and Shri Siddique, Dy. Manager was appointed as an enquiry officer to enquire into the charges levelled against the concerned workman. Ex. M-4 dated 2nd February, 1984, Ex. M-4/1 dated 13th February, 1984 and M-4/2 dated 21st February, 1984 are the notices sent to the concerned workman summoning about the date of enquiry. It is the admitted case of the parties that the concerned workman had attended the enquiry proceeding and that the entire proceeding was in presence of the concerned workman. The concerned workman did not cross-examine any of the management's witnesses. In his statement he had stated that he had nothing further to add to what he had stated in his written reply to the chargesheet. He again repeated his statement about the fact of the death of his mother and about her death on 29th November, 1983. In the end he again requested the management to excuse him for the mistakes he has committed. He expressed that he has not to examine any witness in his defence.

Although M. S. Siddique was the management's representative before the enquiry officer, he has also deposed on certain facts relating to the case. It will appear from his evidence that the concerned workman admitted that on account of sickness of his mother, he was mentally upset and Rs. 1000 was lost on the road in the way from Patherdih Station to Chasnalla Colliery. Shri Siddique further stated that the concerned workman further stated to him that having financial problem the mistake for adjusting the lost amount was made by him and agreed to refund the same and accordingly the concerned workman refunded the amount of Rs. 1000 on 10th November, 1982. MW-3 A. K. Banerjee, Vigilance Officer has also stated that the concerned workman was asked to explain whereupon the concerned workman replied him that on 20th September, 1982 while returning from Patherdih Station with the materials he lost Rs. 1000 on the way to Chasnalla Stores and finding no way to return the money in time he forged the money receipt No. 304033 by making Rs. 630 to Rs. 1630. This is a positive statement of Shri Siddique and Shri A. K. Banerjee that the concerned workman had told them that he had lost one thousand in the way while coming to Chasnalla Stores and that he had made alternation in the railway receipt to denote that the railway receipt was for Rs. 1630 as it was not possible for

him to return the said amount of Rs. 1000. There is absolutely no cross-examination of these two witnesses by the concerned workman as such the facts stated by them are unshaken. Shri F. A. Khan, General Assistant Stores, has stated about the method of advancing money drawn from the accounts department and paying to the assistants for taking delivery of the consignment from the railway station and the method of accounting for the money taken in advance by the Assistant. He has proved the entries in the Cash Register to show that the concerned workman had drawn Rs. 4000 on 20th September, 1983 and the said register was marked Ext. 6 by the Enquiry Officer. He has further stated that after completing the transaction the concerned workman submitted the account to Shri Bhattacharjee, MW-3 Shri S. Bhattacharjee is the Store-Keeper. He has also stated about the method of accounting of the amount advanced to an Assistant for taking delivery of the consignment from the railways. He has further stated that in case the amount of wharfage is higher than Rs. 500 details of such expenditure are explained separately. He further stated that while checking the amount, it was detected that a higher amount had been charged against railway money receipt No. 304033 dated 20th September, 1982. The matter was immediately reported and thereafter as per advice he had changed the entries in the relevant Register. He has stated that the concerned workman refunded Rs. 1547 to Shri F. A. Khan. This witness visited Patherdih Railway Station to check up the actual amount against the railway money receipt No. 304033 and found actual money receipt was issued for Rs. 630 only and not for Rs. 1630 as submitted by the concerned workman. He obtained a certified copy of the railway money receipt No. 304033 dated 20th September, 1982 and the said receipt is marked Ext. No. 13 by the Enquiry Officer. The other important witness examined by the Management in the enquiry proceeding was Shri S. K. Singh, Goods Clerk of Patherdih Railway Station. He has stated that he had prepared the railway money receipt No. 304033 dated 20th September, 1982 for Rs. 630 and on receipt of the said money he took signature of the concerned workman in the delivery book and delivered the materials in question. He showed the original money receipt book containing railway receipt No. 304033 to the Enquiry Officer in presence of the concerned workman and the management's representative. He refused to hand over the railway receipt but on request of the party he issued a duplicate railway money receipt. Ext. No. 12 is the photo copy of the original receipt which was with the railways which is in respect of Rs. 630 only. He has denied to have issued any railway receipt for Rs. 1530. The concerned workman admitted the document and verified his signature on the delivery book. There was no reason as to why the goods clerk would depose falsely. There is nothing in the evidence to show that the goods clerk had manipulated Rs. 630 in the railway receipt as Rs. 1630 which was given to the concerned workman at the time of taking delivery of the consignment.

The railway receipt marked Ext. No. 11 by the Enquiry Officer is the railway receipt which was issued to the concerned workman. This receipt is said to be the carbon copy of the original of Ext. No. 12 but we find the difference. Ext. No. 11 shows that the said railway receipt No. 304033 is in respect of Rs. 1630 whereas Ext. No. 12 is in respect of Rs. 630. If we believe the evidence of Shri M. S. Siddique and the Vigilance Inspector Shri A. K. Banerjee it will appear that the concerned workman had stated before them that Rs. 1000 was lost while he was returning from Patherdih Railway Station to Chasnalla Stores and that as he had no

money he made the alteration in the railway receipt to show that it was for Rs. 1630. The concerned workman also stated in his reply to the chargesheet and also in his statement before the Enquiry Officer that he may be excused this time for the mistake. All these show that the concerned workman had made the alteration in the railway receipt and had accounted for the amount of Rs. 4000 taken by him in advance by showing the amount of Rs. 1630 and the amount of the other railway receipt as expenses and returned the rest. Thus the concerned workman falsely accounted for in respect of Rs. 1000 by showing railway receipt of Rs. 1630 although he made payment of Rs. 630 only. The fact that the concerned workman had lost Rs. 1000 in the way cannot be believed as none of the witnesses have stated that the concerned workman while giving the account of the expenses had stated that Rs. 1000 had been lost in the way. The fact that he made alteration in the receipt itself shows his guilty mind and when it was detected after verification from the railway that the receipt was issued only for Rs. 630, he took up a plea in the statement before the witnesses that Rs. 1000 had been lost in the way. If actually he had lost the amount of Rs. 1000 in the way he could have explained the situation to the management and there was no need of making alteration in the railway receipt to explain that he had made an expenditure of Rs. 1630 in the wharfage of railway receipt No. 304033.

In my opinion the management had adduced sufficient evidence in the enquiry proceeding to show that the concerned workman misappropriated the management's money amounting to Rs. 1000 by tampering the railway receipt No. 304033 dated 20th September, 1982.

Admittedly the concerned workman had deposited the said Rs. 1000 on 10th November, 1982 although he had submitted the account in respect of Rs. 4000 taken as advance by him on 21st September, 1982. On 21st September, 1982 he had accounted for Rs. 1630 in respect of railway receipt No. 304033. The deposit of the said amount of Rs. 1000 at a subsequent date cannot exonerate him of the misconduct which he had already committed.

Ext. 5 marked by the Enquiry Officer is the certified standing orders of Chasnalla Colliery. The concerned workman was charged under clause 18(1)(a) and 18(a)(u) of the said standing orders. So far clause 18(1)(u) is concerned there is no evidence to show that there was any abetment or attempt at abetment of any of the misconduct and as such the concerned workman cannot be held guilty of the charge under clause 18(1)(u) of the standing orders.

Clause 18(1)(a) of the Standing Orders relates to the misconduct of theft, fraud or dishonesty with the employers property or business. The management has been able to establish the said charge of dishonesty with the management's property of Rs. 1000 and fraud committed by the concerned workman by manipulating the railway receipt of Rs. 630 to Rs. 1630. Ext. M-7 is a notesheet which shows that A.G.M.(C) had considered the proceeding of enquiry and the report of the enquiry officer and thereafter he was convinced that the charges levelled against the concerned workman were proved beyond any reasonable doubt and he recommended the dismissal of the concerned workman from company's service. The said dismissal was approved and thereafter the order of dismissal dated 17th July, 1984 was issued by the Chief Mining Engineer vide Ext. M-8. As I have already stated above that there is no evidence in respect of charge under clause 18(1)(u) of the certified standing orders the finding of the management in respect of this clause cannot be accepted.

It has been submitted on behalf of the concerned workman that if any confession of guilt has to be used against a workman the fact of such confession should be a part and parcel of the chargesheet failing which any confessional statement of facts cannot be considered as evidence of guilt of the workman with regard to the misconduct alleged. In support

of his contention he has drawn attention to the case reported in 1985 L&O. I.C. page 422. It was held in the said decision that admission has got to be co-related with the charge only. In the said case there was no other evidence at all except admission and as such it was held by his lordship that the punishment on the basis that the petitioner had admitted the guilt cannot be sustained and as such the factum of misconduct must be established and ordinarily admission alone of the delinquent officer cannot be regarded as sufficient proof of misconduct as well as the facts constituted misconduct. The said decision does not support the view that the fact of confession should be a part and parcel of the chargesheet if any confession of guilt has to be used against a workman. I have not come across such a proposition of law and I feel unable to accept the said view submitted on behalf of the concerned workman. In the present case, as I have already discussed above it will show that there are evidence and circumstances coupled with the documents to support the fact that the concerned workman had committed the misconduct alleged against him and the conclusion is not based on the admission of the concerned workman alone.

In view of the discussion made above I hold that the action of the management of Chasnalla Colliery of M/s. HSCO in dismissing the concerned workman Shri Anutoh Roy Choudhury, Store Keeper is justified and as such he is not entitled to any relief.

This is my Award.

Dated : 23-10-1986.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012/228/85-D. III(A)]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवम्बर, 1986

का.आ. 3981:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुकरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार व भोवरा (दक्षिण) कोलियरी, भोवरा क्षेत्र XI भर्तुत भारत कोकिंग कोल लि. के प्रबंधन से उत्पन्न नियोजकों और उनके कार्गारों के बीच अग्रबंध में निरिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिनियम के पंचद को प्रवर्तित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-10-86 का आदेश द्वारा था।

New Delhi, the 13th November, 1986

S.O. 3981.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhowra (South) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 30th October, 1986.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 122 of 1985

In the matter of industrial disputes under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhowra (South) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI M/s. BCCL and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen—Shri J. D. Lall, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, the 21st October, 1986

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012 (19), 85-D.IV (B) dated the 5th August, 1985.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bhowra (South) Colliery of Bhowra Area No. XI of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Bhowra, Dist. Dhanbad in dismissing the services of Shri Ram Sundar Singh, Piece-rated Trammer of Bhowra (South) Colliery is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

The case of the management is that the concerned workman Ram Sundar Singh was working as a piece-rated trammer in Bhowra (South) Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. Report of misconduct alleged to have been committed by the concerned workman, the Supdt. of Mines/Agent of Bhowra (South) Colliery issued him with a chargesheet dated 10-7-84. The allegation against the concerned workman was that in the night shift duty on 15-7-84, the concerned workman obstructed the supply of sand, timber and other necessary materials in the underground which was very essential for the safety of the mines as well as men. The said misconduct was treated as a misconduct under rule 2(1) of the certified standing orders. The concerned workman submitted his reply to the chargesheet. The said reply was considered to be unsatisfactory by the Supdt. of Mines/Agent of Bhowra (S) Colliery and a detailed enquiry into the charges framed against the concerned workman was ordered. Shri R. N. Singh, Sr. Personnel Officer was appointed as an enquiry to enquire into the charges against the concerned workman. The concerned workman fully participated in the enquiry and he also took the assistance of a co-worker to defend him in the enquiry. All the management's witnesses were examined in presence of the concerned workman and his co-worker and opportunity was given to them to cross examine the management's witnesses. The concerned workman was given the opportunity to give his statement which he did and he also examined two witnesses in his defence. After completing the enquiry, the enquiry officer held the concerned workman guilty of the charges framed against him. The enquiry officer had not fully appreciated the evidence in his enquiry report and as such the Supdt. of Mines/Agent Bhowra (S) Colliery examined the matter in detail and recorded his not giving reasons for finding the concerned workman guilty of the charges framed against him. He also came to the conclusion that taking the seriousness of the charge against the concerned workman, it was a fit case for dismissal of the concerned workman. The said note was submitted to the General Manager/Chief Mining Engineer Bhowra area which was approved and thereafter the concerned workman was dismissed from service by the Supdt. of Mines/Agent by an order dated 26-8-84. It is submitted that the domestic enquiry was held in accordance with the principles of natural justice and all possible opportunities were given to the concerned workman to defend himself. Two other workmen were also charged for the misconduct alleged to have been committed by the concerned workman and they were separately enquired. The case of the concerned workman cannot be compared with those of the other two workmen. It is submitted on behalf of the management that the obstruction need not be physical obstruction and putting difficulties in the way of work of the management would also amount to obstructing the management's work. The dismissal order was issued by the Supdt. of Mines/Agent who is the head of the colliery and it has further approval of the General Manager and the Chief Mining Engineer Bhowra Area. On the above facts it is submitted on behalf of the management that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman from service is fully justified and that the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

The case of the workman is that the concerned workman was working as a permanent piece rated drummer in Bhawla (S) Colliery for the last 20 years. He was served with a chargesheet by the management for misconduct of obstructing the supply of timber/sand to the underground on 10-7-84. He denied the charges in his reply to the chargesheet. Two workers, namely, Sangram Mahato and Jaiji Bahadur Singh who were also co-worker of the concerned workman were chargesheeted for the same misconduct and a departmental enquiry was held into the charges against them. Shri Jaiji Bahadur Singh was also found guilty but was let off with minor punishment for suspension for 10 days. The other workman Sangram Mahato was not found guilty. The concerned workman alone was dismissed from services on the charge of misconduct. The entire charge of obstructing the supply of timber/sand was false and motivated to victimise the concerned workman for his trade union activities for demanding proper wages on behalf of his gang of workers who were piece rated drummers of 27 incline Bhawla (South) Colliery. The chargesheet was vague and the management did not state the manner in which the concerned workman obstructed. The evidence of Shri Bhagawat Prasad Mining Sirdar who was the only witness in whose presence the alleged incident took place was full of contradiction and is not reliable. It was not proper for the enquiry officer to find the concerned workman guilty on the evidence of a solitary witness. The enquiry officer did not give any reason in support of his finding in his enquiry report. The finding of the enquiry officer is perverse in as much as, the charge of obstruction to supply of sand and other materials in the underground has not been proved by the evidence of the management's witnesses. The letter of dismissal shows that the concerned workman has been dismissed for alleged misconduct or wilful insubordination or disobedience of any lawful or reasonable orders of a superior but the same was not the charge in the chargesheet and as such the dismissal order for the above charges is illegal and unjustified. The dismissal order passed by the Supdt. of Colliery/Agent had not been approved as required under the certified standing orders applicable to the colliery. Under certified standing orders every order of dismissal has to be approved by the Agent or the Chief Mining Engineer. The concerned workman is a victim of vindictiveness on the part of the management because the drummers of 27 incline had filed a case under Section 33-C(2) of the I. D. Act before the Central Government Labour Court No. 3 for difference of wages less paid to them and since the concerned workman took initiative as a leader of the gang he has been singled out for the dismissal in order to terrorise other workmen. The action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman was quite illegal, arbitrary and unjustified. It is prayed that the concerned workman may be ordered to be reinstated to his original service with continuity of service and full back wages for the idle period.

Earlier the management had filed a petition to decide as a preliminary issue whether the domestic enquiry held into the charge against the concerned workman was fair and proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The workmen were also challenging the propriety of the domestic enquiry and as such the fairness or the propriety of the domestic enquiry was first taken up for hearing as a preliminary issue and the said issue was decided by this Tribunal by the order dated 9-4-86. It was held in the said preliminary issue that the domestic enquiry held against the concerned workman was fair, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice and thereafter this case was set up for hearing.

Now the point for consideration is whether the management was justified in dismissing the concerned workman. In other words it has to be decided as to whether the charge levelled against the concerned workman had been established in the domestic enquiry and incidentally it has also to be decided whether the punishment inflicted against the concerned workman was proper or not.

The entire file of the domestic enquiry has been produced by the management and it is on the basis of the said record that a decision has to be made whether the charge against the concerned workman as established or not. Ext. M-1 is the chargesheet dated 16-7-84 issued to the concerned workman which is as follows :—

"It has been reported that while you were in the first shift duty on 13-7-84 you obstructed the supply of sand and Timber and other necessary materials of underground which is very essential for the safety of the mines as well as men. This is a gross misconduct under rule 27(1) of the Certified Standing Orders."

Ext.M-2 dated 19-7-84 is the reply of the concerned workman to the said chargesheet. It is stated in the reply that the charge levelled against the concerned workman that he obstructed the supply of the sand/timber to the underground on 16-7-84 in the first shift is totally false. It is further stated that the record would show that sand/timber was supplied as usual in the underground and hence there was no obstruction as alleged in the chargesheet. In the second para of his reply it is stated that since October, 1981 the drummers of 27 incline were being paid full back wages only irrespective of number of times punished by them and that so far no rate of drumming was fixed though NCWA-II came into force with effect from 1-1-83. It is further stated that when they approached the management for fixation of drumming rate, they were being harassed by false motivated chargesheets to silence them, thus the charge is false. It is admitted that the concerned workman along with his co-worker Shri Satya Prakash Thakur had participated in the domestic enquiry into the chargesheet against the concerned workman. Ext. M-3 is the enquiry proceeding which will show that the concerned workman and his co-worker had signed on each page of the proceeding denoting that all the proceedings was gone into in their presence. At the outset the management's representative gave out the facts of the case for which the concerned workman has been charged and the said statement of the management's representative Shri K. D. Srivastava was taken down by the Enquiry Officer. Although he was not a witness to the occurrence, the enquiry officer allowed the concerned workman and his co-worker to put question in cross-examination and the management's representative was cross-examined by the concerned workman. The management representative was not a witness and as such there was no question of putting any reliance on his statement. He had only given out a case of the management.

First witness to be examined before the enquiry officer was Shri A. Kumar, Asstt. Colliery Manager of 27 incline. It was apparent from the statement of Shri A. Kumar before the enquiry officer that it was essential to make a foundation for a pump in the underground mine and for that purpose sand was essential to be taken underground. He has stated that he directed Shri Bhagawat Prasad mining Sirdar to take the ventilation gang in the first shift on 13-7-84 for taking the sand underground in empty tubs. He has stated that sand was not sent underground on that day which he learnt subsequently on enquiry. On 14-7-84 Shri Kumar went to ventilation officer and enquired Shri Bhagawat Prasad as to why the sand was not taken to the underground upon which Shri Bhagwan Prasad told him that as they did not get any tub for taking sand by the concerned workman Shri Ram Bahadur Singh, the sand could not be taken to underground. He has stated that Bhagawat Prasad had told him that the concerned workman had taken the stand that since they did not get money for lowering the materials, they would not allow any materials to go underground. He has stated that since the ventilation group was not allowed to take the materials underground in the tub they did some other work. The second witness to be examined before the enquiry officer was the mining Sirdar Shri Bhagawat Prasad. He has stated that he was deputed by the Ventilation officer on 13-7-84 to lay the foundation for the pump in 27 incline. He had asked for empty tubs from the Asstt. Colliery Manager Shri Kumar who told him to go and as for empty tub from the drummers and then he went and asked the concerned workman for one empty tub for taking the sand. He has stated that the concerned workman who was a Drummer refused to give any empty tub and when the witness asked him as to why he was not providing him the tub, the concerned workman replied that since he does not get money for loading materials he would not give the empty tubs. He has stated that thereafter he took his labourers underground for unloading and stacking bricks near the site of construction of the foundation for the pump. He told about the facts to the ventilation officer. He has also stated that on the next day when

the Asstt. Colliery Manager, Shri Kumar came to Safety office and asked him as to why the job was not done, he informed him of the above facts. From his statement in the cross-examination it will appear that there was no other persons present at the time when he had demanded the tub from the concerned workman and as such we cannot expect other witness of the said occurrence. He has stated that there was another trammmer who had also told him that as they do not get money for the materials so they will not give the tub. He has also stated that there were four empty tubs when this witness had a talk with the concerned workman. It will thus appear from the evidence of Bhagawat Pd. that he had asked for the tub for taking the sand underground but the concerned workman did not give him a tub and the reason for refusal was that the Trammers were not being paid wages for loading materials on the tubs for the underground.

The concerned workman's defence witnesses were Pardeshi Dusad and Sukhar Manjhi. These two persons were also trammers working along with the concerned workman and they had also been charged separately for misconduct for putting obstruction to the supply of materials in the underground. Thus these two defence witnesses are not independent witnesses. The defence witness Pardeshi Dusad has stated that they had told Bhagawat Pd. Mining Sirdar that extra money should be paid to them for extra work. He has admitted in his cross-examination that the Trammers have to make available the tubs when they were required. He knew that in the area office rate for the tubs had been fixed. He has also admitted that along trammers had handled tubs and lowered it into the mines loaded with bricks and sands and other materials. He has stated that on the alleged day one empty tub was made available on the Kota line but the concerned workman has not stated so in his statement before the Enquiry Officer. There is absolutely no case that the concerned workman had made available the tub to the mining sirdar for lowering the sand required for the construction of the platform. The other defence witness Sukhu Manjhi stated that the Mining Sirdar had come for one empty tub and that the tub was available. Thereafter he did not know where the mining sirdar went away. It is clear therefore that the mining sirdar Bhagawat Pd. had demanded a tub from the concerned workman and that the tub was available. Although the defence witness have stated that the tub was made available to the Mining Sirdar but the concerned workman himself has not stated so. It is clear therefore that no tub was made available to the mining sirdar when he had demanded the tub for taking sand underground. One thing will appear from the evidence of the mining sirdar Bhagawat Prasad, the defence witness and the statement of the concerned workman that they (Trammer) had a grievance that they were not being paid for loading of materials and that they had made representation for it. Thus the evidence and the stand of the concerned workman in the case show that as the concerned workman and other trammers had grievance for non payment for loading materials in the tubs, which they were not getting since long, the concerned workman stopped the supply of tub to the mining sirdar. The Mining Sirdar has been thoroughly cross-examined by the concerned workman and there is no suggestion even made to him as to why he would be deposing falsely against the concerned workman. The concerned workman made a grievance against the management for non-payment for some work being done by him but that could not be any reason for the mining sirdar to have any grudge against the concerned workman. In my opinion there was sufficient evidence in the enquiry to show that the concerned workman did not supply the tub for lowering the sand underground when asked by the mining sirdar which led to the stoppage of the construction of the platform for installing of pump inside the mine for the purpose of the safety of the mine and the men working underground and the act of the concerned workman in not supplying the tub to the mining sirdar had actually caused obstruction in the supply of sand underground which was very essential for the safety of the mines and men working underground.

On perusal of the enquiry report Ext. M-6 it will appear that the enquiry officer did not at all discuss the evidence adduced in the enquiry proceeding and did not give any reason regarding his finding. The Supdt./Agent Bhowra South Colliery in his note dated 18-8-84 which is marked

Ext. M-9 has discussed in details the evidence of the witnesses examined on behalf of the management and the concerned workman and also gave reasons for the conclusion that the charge against the concerned workman had been established when the enquiry officer had sent his enquiry report to the said Supdt.-cum-Agent Bhowra (South) Colliery. There is also the note of G.M./C.M.E. Bhowra area showing approval of the dismissal of the concerned workman as suggested by the Supdt./Agent of Bhowra Colliery. Thus the enquiry report of the enquiry officer has merged with the note of the Supdt./Agent of Bhowra (S) Colliery and there can be no grievance of the fact that the witnesses for the parties were not discussed and reasons for the finding was not given.

It is submitted on behalf of the workmen that Ext. M-9 had been subsequently prepared by the Supdt./Agent after the dismissal of the concerned workman. Ext. M-7 dated 26-8-84 is the dismissal order which is undisputed document, I would like to quote the relevant line from para-2 of Ext. M-7 which are as follows to show that Ext. M-9 had been written prior to the order of dismissal :—

"The enquiry officer in his enquiry report has fully established the charge levelled against you. After going through the enquiry proceeding and the report of the enquiry officer I applied my mind independently and have come to the conclusion that the charge levelled against you are fully established beyond any reasonable doubt".

It was on the basis of this order that the concerned workman was dismissed from service. It will appear from Ext. M-7 that the Supdt./Agent of Bhowra (South) Colliery had applied his mind independently and had come to the conclusion that the charge against the concerned workman was established. The said consideration of the enquiry proceeding and the application of mind independently of the Supdt./Agent of Bhowra (South) Colliery is mentioned in Ext. M-9 dated 18-8-84. Thus the dismissal order Ext. M-7 was issued after the note of the Supdt./Agent and the note of approval of the G.M./C.M.E. Bhowra area dated 20-8-84. In the above view of the matter I do not think that Ext. M-9 has been prepared subsequent to the order of dismissal.

There is no denial of the fact that two other workmen who were also working as trammers along with the concerned workman were chargesheeted for misconduct for obstructing to supply the materials on 13-7-84 and out of them one was punished with 10 days suspension and the charge against other workman had not been established and therefore was let off. The evidence adduced against those two workmen is not before me and as such it is not possible for me to say as to what weighed the enquiry officer in passing different orders against them but I do feel that the punishment of dismissal was too harsh against the concerned workman. It appears that the concerned workman had a grievance regarding non-payment of wages for lowering of materials underground since long and it was because of the said dissatisfaction that the concerned workman had refused to supply the tub to the Mining Sirdar. There is no evidence that the rate of tramming for the materials has yet been fixed by the management. Although the workmen should not have stopped the supply of tubs one has to consider the fact that the long felt grievance of the concerned workman and the other trammers were not being fulfilled by the management and having that in their mind the concerned workman had refused to supply the tubs for lowering the sand underground. Taking the above matter into consideration I hold that the order of the dismissal of the concerned workman is too severe.

In the result I hold that the action of the management of Bhowra (S) Colliery of BCCL in dismissing the concerned workman Shri Ram Sunder Singh does not appear to be justified although the charge levelled against him had been established. The concerned workman has been idle since the date of the dismissal and the non-payment of wages for the period from the date of dismissal till the date of joining in my opinion, will be sufficient punishment to the concerned workman and will also be a lesson for him and the other workmen in future that the orders of the superiors should not

be disobeyed. The concerned workman will have continuity of service from the date of dismissal to the date of his joining and the management is directed to reinstate the concerned workman within one month from the date of publication of this Award.

Dated : 21-10-1986.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-24012/19/85-D.IV (B)]

का.आ. 3982.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार व धोरी कोलियरी लै. सण्ड्स कोलफील्ड्स लि. के प्रबंधन से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण के पंचाद को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-10-88 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3982.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Dhori Colliery of M/s. Central Coalfields Limited, P.O. Dhori, Distt. Giridih and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 30th October, 1986.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 135 of 1985

In the matter of industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Dhori Colliery of M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd. and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, the 22nd October, 1986

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-24012(59)/85-D.IV (B) dated the 5th September, 1985.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of (Dhori Colliery of M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Dhori, Distt. Giridih in terminating the services of Shri Mohamed Hadish Alam, ex-register keeper from back date vide letter No. CCL/DC/75/934 dated 17-12-1975 of the Manager, Dhori Colliery is justified? If not, to what relief is concerned workman entitled?"

In this reference both the parties filed their respective W.S. documents etc. Thereafter the reference proceeded along with its course. Ultimately on 16-10-86 both the parties appeared before me and filed a settlement. I have gone through the terms of settlement which appears to me to be fair and beneficial to both the parties. Accordingly I

accept the same and pass an Award in terms of the memorandum of settlement which forms part of the Award as annexure.

Dated : 22-10-1986.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-24012/59/85-D.IV (B)]
R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 DHANBAD

Ref. No. 135 of 1985

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Dhori Colliery of M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Dhori, Distt. Giridih.

AND

Their workmen.

Joint compromise petition of Employers and Workmen

The above-mentioned employers and the workman concerned in the above reference Sri Mohammed Hadish Alam most respectfully beg to submit as follows :—

- (1) That the Management and the workman concerned, Sri Hadish Alam, have jointly negotiated the matter covered by the above reference for the purpose of arriving at a mutual and amicable overall settlement.
- (2) That as a result of the aforesaid negotiations, the management and the workman concerned have come to an amicable and overall settlement of the matter on the following terms and conditions :—
 - (a) It is agreed that the Management shall provide employment to the workman concerned Sri Hadish Alam as Cat. I Mazdoor w.e.f. 20-10-1986 subject to his being found medically fit on the minimum of the pay scale of post of Cat. I Mazdoor in the NCWA-III pay scale.
 - (b) It is agreed that the workman concerned will not be entitled to any back wages or any other benefit in regard to his past service or the intervening period, except the continuity of service for the purpose of payment of gratuity act.
 - (c) It is agreed that this is an overall settlement in respect of all the claims of the workman concerned in respect of the aforesaid reference.
- (3) That the employers and the workman concerned consider that the aforesaid terms and conditions are fair, just and reasonable to both the parties.

In view of the above, the employers and the workman concerned jointly pray that the Honble Tribunal may be pleased to give an award in terms of this Joint Compromise petition and dispose of the reference accordingly.

Sd/-

(HADISH ALAM)

Workman concerned

WITNESSES :

1. Sd/- Illegible
2. Sd/- Illegible

Project Officer/Agent Dhori Colliery
Central Coalfields Ltd.
for and behalf of employers
Sd/-
(R. S. MURTHY)
Advocate
for employers.

Dated : 16-10-1986.

नई दिल्ली, 13 नवंबर, 1986

का.आ. 3983.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, न्यू बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30 अक्टूबर, 1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 13th November, 1986

S.O. 3983.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby published the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the New Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 30th October, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. KALRA, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
NEW DELHI.
I.D. No. 6/78

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri R. N. Rath, through

The General Secretary,

New Bank of India Employees Congress.

C/o New Bank of India Ltd., MI Road, Jaipur.

Versus

The General Manager,

The New Bank of India Ltd.,

Central Office, 1, Tolstoy Marg,

New Delhi.

APPEARANCES :

Shri N. C. Sikri with Shri Inder Bir Singh for
Management.

None for the workman.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its notification No. L-12012/46/77-D.II.A dated 3-1-78 have referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of New Bank of India Ltd., 1-Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi in not promoting Shri R. N. Rath, Clerk-cum-Cashier, to the post of Head Clerk and thereupon to the post of Accountant is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to and from what date?"

2. Some of the undisputed facts are that the workman Shri R. N. Rath was appointed as a Clerk-cum-Cashier by the Management on 16-3-1970 at 31, Chowranghee Road, Calcutta Branch and was confirmed in the said post w.e.f. 16-9-70. At the request of the workman he was transferred from Calcutta Branch to Doongarh Branch (Rajasthan) vide the Management's letter No. Est/13783 dated 5-10-72 Ex. M-10. The workman was relieved from the Calcutta Branch on 13-10-72 and he joined this Doongarh Branch on 19-10-72. The workman was promoted as Head Clerk on 11-12-76 and at present is posted as a Special Assistant which is a cadre higher than that of Head Clerk. The post of Accountant is in the officer cadre and not in the workman cadre.

3. The case of the workman is that he was paid his salary for the period 13-10-72 to 19-10-72 at Doongarh and therefore, his seniority at Doongarh is effective from 13-10-72. It is the further case of the workman that in accordance with the promotion policy of the Management he became eligible for promotion to the post of Head Clerk on 15-3-73 as by that time he had completed three years of service in the Bank and had worked mainly on clerical side for more than two years and that he should have been considered for promotion against any vacancy or vacancies which arose in the State after 15-3-73. However, he was ignored and many persons junior to him were promoted on account of victimisation for his trade union activities.

4. The Management admits that persons junior to the workman have been promoted but its plea is that the promotions have been legally and validly made in accordance with the Bipartite Settlements dated 17-5-72 and 12-12-73. Its further case is that the workman was transferred to Doongarh (Rajasthan) from a different state at his own request and in terms of clause B (2)(b) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 11-5-72 (Copy Ex. M-11) the workman could not be considered for promotion before he had completed three years of service in the State of Rajasthan. In other words the workman could be considered for promotion only after 19-10-75 when he completed three years of service in Rajasthan. The Management's further contention is that the date from which the period for purposes of promotion is to be reckoned is 19-10-75 when the workman joined duty at Doongarh and not 13-10-72 when he relinquished his charge at Calcutta. Sufficient number of clerks who possessed the requisite qualifications were available and they were promoted against vacancies which arose before 19-10-75. The Management has denied that the workman was ignored from promotion because of victimisation on account of his trade union activities and has asserted that he could not have been promoted because he had not completed the requisite service of three years in the State when other officials were promoted for the period upto 19-10-75. It has further been stated that after 19-10-75 no person junior to the workman was promoted and when the earliest vacancy arose, the workman was promoted as Head Clerk w.e.f. 11-12-76. It has further been stated that the workman was not considered for promotion as Accountant because the workman had never applied for the post of Accountant which is a Selection Post and promotion to the Accountant cadre are governed by the settlement dated 12-12-73 in terms of which eligible employees having minimum of three years of service in the bank are required to submit their applications offering their candidature for promotion and only those employees who have submitted their applications are called for written test and interview but as the workman had never submitted any application the question of denying him the promotion as Accountant does not arise. It was further added that the Management had not promoted any employee as Accountant in violation of the settlement dated 12-12-73.

5. The Management has also raised several legal objections but out of them only one was pressed at the time of arguments i.e. the post of Accountant is in the Officer Cadre and that the reference in so far as it relates to the non-promotion of the workman as Accountant is not maintainable. It was contended by Shri N. C. Sikri appearing for the Management that the reference is severable and the second part of the reference relating to the non-promotion of the workman as Accountant should be dismissed as not maintainable for this short ground. Since the other objections were not pressed they are not being mentioned. However, I do not find any force in this objection of the Management because the claimant continues to be a workman till he is appointed as an Accountant and it is only after he has been appointed as an Accountant that he joins the officer cadre and then he is debarred from raising the industrial dispute. The claimant can certainly agitate for his promotion to the officer cadre because till the said promotion takes place he remains a workman. Hence this objection of the Management is rejected.

6. The contention of the Management that the seniority for the purpose of promotion is to be reckoned from 19-10-72 when the workman joined duty in the Doongarh Branch in Rajasthan is unexceptionable. The fact that the workman

was paid his wages for the period 13-10-72 when he left charge at Calcutta to 19-10-72 when he resumed duty at Doongarh by the Doongarh Branch does not mean that his seniority in the State of Rajasthan began to run from 13-10-72. He had to be paid his wages by the Management and it hardly mattered whether the wages were paid by the Calcutta Branch or the Doongarh Branch but the fact remains that he started working at Doongarh Branch w.e.f. 19-10-72 and his seniority is to run from that date and the contention of the workman that his seniority should be reckoned from 13-10-72 is without any justification and is hereby rejected. The contention of the workman that for the purpose of promotion he became eligible w.e.f. 15-3-75 when he completed three years of service in the respondent bank is also without any force because it goes counter to the terms of settlement dated 17-5-72 Ex. M-11 which is binding on both the parties. The clause B(2)(b) of the settlement dated 17-5-72 Ex. M-11 unambiguously provides that no clerk shall be considered for promotion to the cadre of Head Clerk unless he has completed three years of service in the bank and 3 years of service in the particular State in case he is transferred from one State to another, (emphasis supplied). However, where there is no clerk having three years of service in the bank available in a particular State the clerk transferred from another State if any shall rank for promotion provided he has completed three years of service in the bank and in that case the condition of minimum of service of three years in that State shall not apply. It is not the case of the workman that there were no other clerks having three years service in the bank available in the State of Rajasthan when the promotions were made for the period upto 19-10-75. In fact the Management has candidly given all the particulars of the various clerks who are promoted during this period and for facility of reference names of those officials and their service particulars and the actual dates of promotion are reproduced below :—

S. No.	Name	Date of appointment	Date of which became eligible for promotion as an Head Clerk	Actual date of promotion as an Head Clerk
1.	Shri H.P. Bhangur	8-7-65	8-7-68	20-6-73
2.	Shri Shyam Sharma	1-1-70	1-1-73	1-3-73
3.	Shri A.R. Bhandari	5-1-70	5-1-73	5-5-73
4.	Shri B.L. Somani	14-1-70	14-1-73	27-2-74
5.	Shri R.C. Jain	10-11-70	10-11-73	16-7-74
6.	Shri S.S. Phophaliya	1-3-71	1-3-74	16-7-74
7.	Shri S.K. Aggarwal	7-6-71	7-6-74	16-7-74
8.	Shri R.N. Kankani	17-2-71	17-2-74	16-7-74
9.	Shri R.L. Bhardwaj	1-6-71	1-6-74	16-7-74
10.	Shri R.S. Lokhotia	28-10-71	28-10-74	1-2-75
11.	Shri N.R. Gupta	3-8-71	3-8-74	1-2-75
12.	Shri L.C. Mittal	24-12-70	24-12-73	16-8-75
13.	Shri M. Loonker	1-1-72	1-1-75	16-8-75
14.	Shri M.C. Sone	1-10-71	1-10-74	16-10-75
15.	Shri R.C. Jhanwar	9-11-71	9-11-74	1-2-75

7. It is, therefore, clear that all the clerks who have been promoted as Head Clerks before 19-10-75 possessed the requisite qualifications and were eligible for promotion whereas the workman was not eligible for promotion till 19-10-75 and hence there is no irregularity in the action of the Management and the allegation of victimisation on account of trade union activities is not substantiated.

8. The promotion to the post of Accountant is governed by the settlement dated 12-12-1973 Ex. M-12 which again is binding on the parties. Clause 4 of this settlement is reproduced below :—

“4. Announcement of Vacancies :

- (i) The Bank shall notify, through the means of a circular (a copy of which shall be displayed on the notice board of every office of the Bank), the total number of vacancies required to be filled up in terms of the provisions of this settlement. Such circular shall also stipulate the last date for submission of applications (normally three weeks from the date of issuance.)
- (ii) The eligible employee including confirmed Head Clerks/Special Assistants shall submit their applications in the prescribed proforma through the Manager of the branch or the departmental head at the Head Office/Regional Office, as the case may be.
- (iii) The eligibility of the employees, applying for promotion to the officer cadre, in terms of Clause 2 and 3 above shall be scrutinised as on 31st December and 30th June every year in relation to the vacancies notified in January and July respectively.”

8. It is abundantly clear from the above provisions of the settlement dated 12-12-73 that the eligible employees are required to submit their applications for being considered for promotion to the post of Officer Cadre from clerical cadre. The Management has categorically stated that the workman did not make any application for being considered for promotion and for this reason he could not have been called for the subsequent written test and interview and considered for promotion and the question of denying him promotion does not arise. The workman has nowhere stated in the claim statement that he had made any such application. Even after it had been asserted by Shri M. S. Rekhi MW-1 in his affidavit that the workman never applied for the post of Accountant which is a Selection Post and the question of his appointment to the said post could not and did not arise and further that in terms of the settlement dated 12-12-73 the workman was required to submit such an application offering his candidature for promotion, the workman did not state that he had made any such application. Even in the cross-examination of Shri M. S. Rekhi MW-1 no suggestion was made that the workman had made any application offering his candidature for promotion. Hence the blame lies with the workman himself and Management cannot be faulted for not considering the workman for promotion to the post of Accountant.

9. In view of the discussion made above it is held that the action of the Management of New Bank of India Ltd. (Now New Bank of India) 1, Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi in not promoting Shri R.N. Rathie Clerk-cum-Cashier to the post of Head Clerk and thereupon to the post of Accountant is quite justified and in order and the workman is not entitled to any relief. Hence this reference is disposed of accordingly leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

Further it is ordered that the requisite number of copies of this Award may be forwarded to the Central Govt. for necessary action at their end.

August 20, 1986.

G. S. KALRA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-12012/46/77-D.II(A)ID.IV(A)]

का.आ. 3984.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, ट्यूरिकोरिन पत्तन न्यास के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, तमिलनाडु के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 4 नवम्बर, 1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3984.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby published the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Tamil Nadu as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Tuticorin Port Trust and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

BEFORE THIRU PYZEE MAHMOOD, B.S.C., B.L., PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, TAMIL NADU, MADRAS

(Constituted by the Central Government)
Tuesday, the 21st day of October, 1986
Industrial Dispute No. 59 of 1986

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the Management of Tuticorin Port Trust, Tuticorin.)

BETWEEN

The Workmen represented by
The Secretary,
Tuticorin Port Aluvalar Sangam,
Tuticorin.

AND

The Chairman,
Tuticorin Port Trust, Tuticorin.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-44012/485-D.IV(A), dated 20-8-1986 of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of Thiruvallargal M. Venkatachalapathy, S. Krishnan and Sri Ram, Advocates for the Management upon perusing the reference and other connected papers on record and the Petitioner-Union being absent, this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

This dispute between the workmen and the Management of Tuticorin Port Trust, Tuticorin arises out of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in its Order No. L-44012/485-D.IV(A), dated 20-8-1986 of the Ministry of Labour for adjudication of the following issue :

Is the management of Tuticorin Port Trust justified in imposing a penalty of stoppage of one increment for two years on Shri V. Richard Vincent, Operator, Gr. II of Tuticorin Port vide the Management's Order No. E(M)/26/484, dated 3-9-1984 ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?

(2) Parties were served with summons for the hearing on 25-9-1986.

(3) On 25-9-1986, the Management was represented by counsel. The Union was absent and no representation was made.

(4) Today, when the dispute was called the Petitioner-Union was absent and no representation was made. No claim statement was received or filed.

(5) Hence the claim of the workman is dismissed for default. Award is passed accordingly. No costs.

Dated, this 21st day of October, 1986

PYZEE MAHMOOD,

Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal
[No. L-4402/485-D.IV(A)]

का.आ. 3985:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, कान्दला पोर्ट ट्रस्ट प्रशासन के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, गुजरात के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5 नवंबर, 1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3985.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby published the award of the Industrial Tribunal Gujarat as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Kandla Port Trust and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th November, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI G. S. BAROT, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT AHMEDABAD

Reference (ITC) No. 29 of 1985

ADJUDICATION

BETWEEN

The management of Kandla Port Trust

AND

Their workmen.

In the matter of retirement age in respect of Sarvashri Suleman Ali and Suleman Osman.

APPEARANCES :

Shri M. J. Sheth—for the Kandla Port Trust.

Shri H. M. Bhatt—for the workmen.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between the management of the Kandla Port Trust and their workmen has been referred for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, by the Central Government vide Ministry of Labour, Order No. L-37012(1)/85-D.IV(A) dated 29-12-1985. The dispute relates to the matter specified in the Schedule annexed to the order of reference, viz:—

"Whether the action of the management of Kandla Port Trust Gandhidham in reducing the age of retirement from 60 to 58 in respect of S/Shri Suleman Ali and Suleman Osman, Lascars and directing them to retire w.e.f. 31-12-1984 and 31-1-1985 respectively is justified? If not, to what relief they are entitled?"

2. It appears that Shri Suleman Ali and Shri Suleman Osman ('the workers concerned' to be brief) were working with the Kandla Port as daily-rated workers with effect from 21-5-1971 and 21-5-1970, respectively. It is the say of the Kandla Port Trust that they were working as Marine Khalasis on casual basis, which is not contradicted on behalf of the workers concerned. They were appointed on regular establishment as Marine Khalasis with effect from 1-1-1977 and 31-12-1976 respectively. Both of them were retired on superannuation on 31-12-1984 on completion of 58 years of age the birth date of both of them being 31-12-1926 (mention about Shri Suleman Osman having been retired on 31-1-1985 made in the order of reference seems to be erroneous). The question which arises for determination in the present reference is, what was the superannuation age for these two workers—whether 58 or 60?

3. In order to decide the point at issue, we shall have to go into certain Rules and/or Regulations and to find out as to which of them will apply to the workers concerned. But before doing so, it would be profitable to narrate briefly the sequence of events that took place and the Rules and/or

or Regulations that came to be framed with each event. Prior to the year 1964, Kandla Port was under the immediate charge of the Port Administrative Officer appointed by the Central Government. However, with the enactment of the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (which appears to have come into effect from 29-2-1964), Kandla Port Trust was constituted with a Board of Trustees. Sec. 28 of the said Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 ("the said Act" to be brief) is relevant for the purposes of this case. It is as under :—

"28. Power to make regulations—A Board may make regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, to provide for any one or more of the following matters, namely :—

- (a) the appointment, promotion, supervision, reduction in rank, compulsory retirement, removal and dismissal of its employees;
- (b) their leave, leave allowances, pensions, gratuities, compassionate allowances and travelling allowances and the establishment and maintenance of the Provident Fund or any other fund for their welfare;
- (c) the terms and conditions of service of persons who become employees of the Board under clause (f) of sub-section (1) of Section 29;
- (d) the time and manner in which appeals may be preferred under sub-section (2) of Section 25 and procedure for deciding such appeals;
- (e) any other matter which is incidental to, or necessary for, the purposes of regulating the appointment and conditions of service of its employees."

Then Section 124(1) of the said Act states that no regulation made by the Board under the said Act (other than a regulation made under sub-section (2) of section 17), shall have effect until it has been approved by the Central Government and until such approval has been published in the Official Gazette. Now, in exercise of the powers conferred on it under the said Section 28, the Board (i.e. the Board of Trustees) of the Kandla Port made the Kandla Port Employees (retirement) Regulations, 1978, which, admittedly, came into force vide Notification issued in the Official Gazette on 4-1-1981. The relevant Regulation therein, for our purpose, is Regulation 4(a), (b) and (c), which is reproduced hereunder:—

- "(a) Except as otherwise provided in these Regulations, every employee of the Board shall retire from service on the afternoon of the last day of the month in which he attains the age of fifty-eight years.
- (b) An employee who is a workman and who entered the Board's service before 11th April, 1974, shall retire from service on the afternoon of the last day of the month in which he attains the age of 60 years.
- (c) An employee in Class IV service or post, who was in service of the Board before 11th April, 1974, shall retire from service on the afternoon of the last day of the month in which he attains the age of 60 years.

Reading the above, it is clear firstly that all employees who are not "workmen" or in Class IV service have to retire on the afternoon of the last day of the month in which they attain the age of 58 years. Secondly, even those who are "workmen" or in Class IV service but who have not entered the Board's service before 11-4-1974, have also similarly to retire on completion of 58 years. Only those who are "workmen" or who are in Class IV service and who have entered the Board's service before 11-4-1974 are to retire on the afternoon of the last day of the month in which they attain the age of 60 years. Now let us consider the position of the workmen concerned in the light of the above.

4. It is true that the workers concerned were working with the Kandla Port from the year 1970 or 1971. But the moot point is whether they were either "workmen" or employees in Class IV service at the time they started working with the Kandla Port. Admittedly, at that time the workers concerned were governed by F.R. 56 under which a "workman" is defined as a highly skilled, skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled artisan employed on a monthly-rated pay. It is not in dispute that the workers concerned were not on monthly-rated pay but were on daily-rated pay, till they were taken up on the regular establishment. Therefore, they were not "workmen" prior to the date on which they were appointed on regular establishment as Marine Khalasis with effect from 1-1-1977 and 31-12-1976 respectively. There was no question of their being in Class IV service (all they were appointed on regular establishment in 1977/1976. Reading the Regulation 4(b) and 4(c) closely, it does appear that the intention is to grant the benefit of retirement at the age of 60 only to those who entered the Board's service, or were in the Board's service, prior to 11-4-1974 as either workmen or as Class IV employees. The workers concerned being neither of these at that time, they will be governed by Regulation 4(a) only and as per that Regulation their retirement age would be 58 years.

5. Shri Bhatt appearing for the union representing the workers concerned has drawn my attention to a resolution passed by the Board of Trustees of the Port on 26-4-1974, under which the Board had adopted the Central Government Civil Service (Pension) Rules, 1972. According to Shri Bhatt, when these Pension Rules are applied to the workers concerned, their retirement age would be 60 years and not 58 years. Now, if we look to these Pension Rules, under Rule 35 of the said Rules, it is stated as under :—

superannuation pension shall be granted to a Government servant who is retired on his attaining the age of compulsory retirement."

Now the age of compulsory retirement of all Government employees has been laid down in F.R. 56. However, it is very pertinent to note here that under Regulation 6 of the Kandla Port Employees (Retirement) Regulations, 1978 referred to above, it is clearly laid down :

"The provisions of the Central Government's Fundamental Rule 56, as adopted and as amended by the Board ... are hereby repealed."

It is very clear, therefore, that the provisions pertaining to retirement age contained in F.R. 56 have been replaced by the Kandla Port Employees (Retirement) Regulations, 1978 and thus so far as retirement age is concerned, what will be applicable to the employees is not F.R. 56 but the above regulations. To that extent, the said Pension Rules would not be applicable to the employees of the Port Trust.

6. Shri Bhatt has also referred to the provisions of Sec. 26J of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Needless to say that the provisions of the said Sec. 25J have no bearing on the point at issue as they refer to lay off and retrenchment which is not the case herein.

7. It is clear from the above discussion that the age of compulsory retirement applicable to the workers concerned was 58 years and they have, therefore, been rightly retired on their attaining the age of 58 years. No question of the Kandla Port Trust having reduced their retirement age arises. This disposes of the present reference. No order as to costs.

Ahmedabad.

Dated : 8th October, 1986.

G. S. BAROT, Industrial Tribunal

[No. L-37012/1/85-D.IV(A)]

K. J. DYVA PRASAD, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 नवम्बर, 1986

का.आ. 3986:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसूचन में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मोनियर सुपरिटेन्डेंट ऑफ पोस्ट ऑफिस नागपुर सिटी विभाग के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदोष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 6-11-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 14th November, 1986

S.O. 3986—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Offices Nagpur City Division, Nagpur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th November, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL—
CUM-LABAUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)
Case No. CGIT/ICR(R44)/1985

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Senior Suptd. of Post Offices, Nagpur City Division, Ciripath, Nagpur and their workman, Shri A. B. Gughane, Postman, represented through Shri B. N. Bagale, Advocate, Nagpur (M.S.).

APPEARANCES :

For workman—Shri B. N. Bagale., Advocate, Nagpur.

For management—Shri S. V. Nattu, Advocate, Nagpur.

DISTRICT : Nagpur (M.S.) —INDUSTRY : P & T

AWARD

Dated : October 27, 1986

In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (d) of Sub-section (1) of sub-section (2A) of Sec. 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour have referred the following dispute for adjudication vide Notification No. L-40012(26)/83-D.II (B) dated 26th December, 1984 :—

“Whether the action of the Senior Suptd. of Post Offices Nagpur City Division, Nagpur in terminating the services of Shri A. B. Gughane, Postman with effect from 2-8-83 is fair & legal ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?”

2 The case of the workman, Shri A. B. Gughane, is that he was employed as a casual labour as postman with effect from 8-5-1981 to 2-8-1983 in the City Post Office, Itwari, Nagpur for which the Assistant Postmaster (Delivery) Nagpur City issued a certificate dated 6-8-1983. He served the department with sincerity and honestly during all these two years. He belongs to C. B. Class and came from Employment Office. He is the son of Shri Balkrishna Baliram Gughane who retired as Sorting Postman from the City Post Office, Nagpur. He has passed Metric Examination of the Nagpur Secondary Education Board. The department all of a sudden ousted him for no reasons whatsoever and employed new persons with a view to deprive him of the benefits of regular employment on his completion of statutory service which amounts to unfair labour practice. This is in violation of the recent orders issued by the Central Government.

3. The case of the management is that he was not employed as a casual labour but only engaged as a daily wages

postman in leave vacancies and other exigencies of postal requirements. Assistant Post Master had no authority to give him the certificate of service. In this capacity he worked for the following days :—

1981—186 days

1982—295 days

1983—151 days

Further as soon as the approved candidates become available and recruited as per the Indian Postal and Telegraphs (Class IV Posts) Recruitment Rules, 1970 presnos engaged on daily wages were discontinued. Rest of the allegations are denied.

4. The mangement has further raised the legal objections that discontinuance of the workman does not amount to discharge, dismissal or retrenchment hence there is no industrial dispute as defined under Sec. 2(k) of the I.D. Act. Workman is neither a 'workman' nor the management an 'industry' as defined under the Act. It is performing the duties of sovereign function hence this reference is not competent.

5. Management have filed certain documents along with the written statement. Management's witness, Shri Ziaul Mannan (M.W.1) has stated that the workman has worked for the following number of days in each year from 1981 to 1983.—

1981—186 days

1982—295 days

1983—151 days

He has further stated that as per the Departmental Rules P & T Manual Vol. IV under the Leading 'Casual Labour' private candidates are those who are sponsored by the Employment Exchange and passed the test conducted by the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices after they have worked each year for 240 days for two years. These workmen were not taken as per above rules since private candidates were available i.e. those appointed vide Ex. M/2. The management has filed Statement 'A' along with the written statement. The statement goes to show that he workmen hat worked on daily wages from Sept. 1982 to August 1983 as under:—

Sept. 82	--- 25days
Oct.	-- 23 days
November	— 24 days
Dec.	— 25 days
January 83	— 25 days
February	— 24 days
March	— 19 days
April	— 14 days
May	— 17 days
June	-- 26 days
July	— 25 days
August 83	--- 1 day

I, therefore, take them as correct and proceed on that assumption.

6. The plea of the management is that since the workman in the year 1983 (the year of stoppage of work) did not work for 240 days therefore the workman is not entitled to the protection of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act since this section requires continuous service for not less than one year. It has been further contended that as the statement of work done in such year shows that he has in no case in continuous service therefore he cannot be treated as casual worker on daily wages. I am unable to agree with any of the above contentions of the management in view of the legal position in this regard for the purpose of Sec. 26F of the I.D. Act the legislature has created a legal fiction by way of Sec.

25B of the I.D. Act. Firstly Sub-section (1) of Sec. 25B of the I.D. Act says :—

"That the workman shall be deemed to be in continuous service for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service including—or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman."

In the instant case, it is crystal clear that cessation of work in every month was not due to any fault on the part of the workman but in fact it appears that the workman was given breaks either intentionally or because the work was not available for him, therefore on account of legal fiction he will be deemed to have been in continuous service for that period.

7. Second limb of the management's contention is that in any case in the year 1983 he did not work for 240 days. This too is fallacious. From the statement 'A' annexed with the statement of claim filed by the management it comes out that the workman has worked 248 days preceding 12 calendar months from the date of termination of the workman. Of course, he did work intermittently as shown in the statement filed by the management.

8. In his book 'The Law of Industrial Disputes' Fourth Edition, Vol. 2, learned Author, Shri O. P. Malhotra, relying on various authorities at pages 13-11-1312 has commented.—

"That sub-section (2) provides for a fiction to treat a workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered an uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered service for a period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in Sub-section 2(a), it is necessary to determine first the relevant date i.e., the date of termination of service which is complained of as 'retrenchment', after that date is ascertained, move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain in whether within the period of 12 months, the work has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favour of the workman, pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in sub-section (2), it will have to be assumed that the workman is in 'continuous service for a period of one year' and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25B".

9. Now the management has not pointed out any reason nor I see any to differ from the views of the learned Author. In any case the wordings of Sec. B also go to show that this interpretation is the only plausible interpretation.

10. On behalf of the management reliance is placed on the recruitment Rules Ex. M/1. Clause 7(a) says that "they will be selected and appointed to the number of vacancies in the order of vacancies in the order of merit in which they pass the literacy test and had a minimum service of four years and sponsored by the Employment Exchange etc. Clause 9 of these very rules gave preference to ex-departmental casual labourers and part time casual labourers. Therefore, burden was on the management to prove and show that they had given an opportunity to this workman that he fulfils those qualifications but no such opportunity of even literacy test appears to have been given to him. In any way, management's witness Shri Zisul Mannan (M.W.1) has admitted that after Ext. M-1 the Departmental instructions dated 21-3-1979 reproduced in the office letter dated 11-11-1983 were issued, therefore these latest instructions will supersede the earlier instructions. These instructions had done away with the requirement of Employment Exchange and the age limit and had given various concessions to casual labourers. Of course, only for persons engaged upto certain period. Therefore the principle will apply to the casual employees whose services were dispensed with even later on the principle of natural justice. However, even if I hold that the workman does not qualify for recruitment rules Ex. M/1 and departmental in-

structions even then it does effect the case of the workman. Once a workman sails into the harbours of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act his termination for whatsoever reason amounts to retrenchment. In the case of Mohan Lal V. Mangem of M/s. Bharat Electronics Ltd. (AIR 1981 SC 1253) the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under :—

"Rictis and semantics apart, termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason whatsoever would constitute retrenchment except in cases in the section itself."

In AIR 1980 SC 1215 it has been even held that the discharge for not passing test for Foreman amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Sec. 26F of the I.D. Act. In the instant case, admittedly the management has not complied with the provisions of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act, Therefore the retrenchment is void ab initio.

11. The third limb of the management's contention is that the discontinuance of service does not amount to retrenchment etc. Therefore it does not amount to an industrial dispute. I have already held that it amounts to retrenchment. Secondly Sec. 2A of the I.D. Act clearly lays down that where any employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with, or arising out of, such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute.

12. Fourth and the last contention of the management is that the management was acting in his sovereign function and the workman is neither a workman nor the management an 'industry' this has been repelled in the case of P & T Department Vs. Its workmen [1984 FLR (49) p. 37]. Since his discontinuance amounts to retrenchment it being void I answer the reference as under :—

That the action of the Senior Supdt. of Post Offices Nagpur City Division, Nagpur in terminating the services of Shri A. B. Gughane, Postman, with effect from 2-8-1983 is unfair, unjust and illegal. As such the workman concerned is entitled to be reinstated with full back wages and all other incidental benefits. No order as to costs.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer
[No. L-40012/26/83-D.II(B)]

का. आ. 3987:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, सीनियर सुपरीटेंडेंट आफ पोस्ट आफिस सिटी विभाग, नागपुर के प्रबंधन में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 6-11-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3987.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Senior Superintendent of Post-Offices City Division, Nagpur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th November, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT(LC(R)(92)/1984

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Offices City Division, Nagpur and their workman, Shri P. N. Thool, Postman.

represented through the President, All India P & T Employees Federation, HQ 51, Telecom Colony, Nagpur-22. (MS).

APPEARANCES :

For Union—Shri V. N. Bagale, Advocate.

For Management—Shri S. V. Natu, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : P & T

—DISTRICT : Nagpur (M.S.)

AWARD

Dated, October 24, 1986

This is a reference made by the Central Government vide Notification No. 1-40012(28)/83-D.II(B) Dated 2nd November 1984, referring the following dispute for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Office City Division, Nagpur in relation to their Nagpur City Head Post Office in terminating/discontinuing the service of Shri P. N. Thool Postman on daily wages w.e.f. 8-8-83 and reappointing him as ED Chowkidar on lower pay is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?”

2. The case of the applicant Shri P. N. Thool (hereinafter referred to as the workman) is that he was employed as daily wages Postman, Nagpur City Head Post Office with effect from 16-10-1979 and he worked continuously for three years ten month i.e. 1150 days service till his services were abruptly terminated with effect from 8-8-1983. He was appointed by the competent authority. His services were terminated without any notice or retrenchment compensation.

3. The work of the postman is of perennial nature. Since he has already completed more than 240 days continuous service he has attained the status of temporary workman under Sec. 25B of the I.D. Act.

4. In pursuance of the Supreme Court Judgment Bangalore Water & Sewage Board Vs. Rajappa the Director General, P & T Deptt. New Delhi vide his Memo No. 45/19/79 SPB dated 6-4-1979 directed to regularise the daily wages employees on the following conditions :—

- (i) Those employees who have already served 240 days;
- (ii) VIII Standard Education qualification; and
- (iii) 31 years aged employees are to be treated to be eligible for regularisation.

The above Memo nowhere stated that literacy test is to be held for determining suitability towards regularisation because of the fact that there is a prescribed qualification i.e. VIII Standard Education.

5. During the year 1982 the then Senior Superintendent of Post Offices conducted a farce literacy test. In that test too the name of the workman, P. N. Thool, was systematically omitted and his junior Shri D. K. Dongre was allowed to appear in the said test and was regularised in Group D with effect from 1-12-82. Thus regularisation of services of a junior by ignoring the senior official amounts to discrimination. This appears to have intentionally done to cause injury to the workman. In any case the termination of services of the workman with effect from 8-8-1983 without any reasons, notice, retrenchment compensation amounts to breach of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act. It is also contended that the termination was mala fide and without competence under Rule 93 of P & T Manual Vol. VIII and Schedule of Powers laid down on page No. 282 of P & T Manual Vol. III wherein it has been laid down that the Gazetted Postmaster being appointing authority is the only competent officer to terminate the service and not the Superintendent of Post Offices. The whole action was therefore without competence, therefore ultra vires void and unfair labour practice. Therefore the workman is entitled to be reinstated with full back wages and other benefits.

6. The case of the management is that Shri P. N. Thool was engaged on daily wages at Nagpur City Head Office on 16-10-1979 and was working intermittently upto 27-6-83.

Thereafter he was not engaged due to availability of approved candidates at Nagpur City Post Office. Management has admitted in their written statement that the workman has thus completed 240 days in each year for two years. In the literacy test held in 1982 he was not permitted due to late registration at Employment Exchange. He was however permitted to appear for the literacy test held during 1983. As per Department Rules (Appl. 12 of P & T Man. Vol. IV an outsider engaged on daily wages can be appointed on regular basis only after successfully coming through the departmental test. Shri Thool has agreed to work on any post therefore he was given an appointment as E.D. Chowkidar at Ayodhya Nagar Post Office with effect from 19-9-1983 purely on humanitarian grounds which he voluntarily accepted to join the post. He could not be regularised as he was not come out successfully through the departmental test. The management has further contended that as per instruction of the Ministry of Home Affairs, circulated under PUM Bombay letter No. R & E 25/orders/VII/83 dated 3-12-1983 casual employees who have been recruited prior to 21-3-1979 are only to be regularised. Shri Thool does not come under the purview of these instructions.

7. The workman, P. N. Thool (W.W.I), has stated on oath that he is a Scheduled Caste candidate by caste Mahar. He was directly appointed by the Post Master, City Post Office, Nagpur as Postman on 16-10-1981. From that date he worked regularly till 7th August 1983 on which date his services were terminated without any notice or compensation in lieu thereof and without retrenchment compensation. He was appointed extra departmental chokidar from 19-9-1983 and he is still working on that post. Shri Dongre who was junior to him was taken in his place vide Order Ex. W/2 dated 15-7-82.

8. On the other hand, management has examined Shri Ziaul Mannan (M.W.I) has stated on oath Shri Thool works in the department as under :—

1981—284 days

1982—273 days

1983—178 days

He has further stated that as per the Departmental Rules, P & T Manual Vol. IV under the heading ‘Casual labour’ private candidates are those who are sponsored by the Employment Exchange and passed the literacy test conducted by the Senior Supdt. of Post Office if they have worked for 240 days for 2 years.

These workmen were not taken as per above rules. Private candidates were available in 1983 (vide Ex. M/2) so they were employed thereafter and there was no vacancy for these workmen. The number of actual days worked by the workman has not been challenged before me. I, therefore, take the workman's contention as correct and proceed on that assumption.

9. The plea of the management is that since this workman in the year 1982-83 (the year of stoppage of work) did not work for 240 days therefore the workman is not entitled to the protection of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act since this section requires continuous service for not less than one year. It has been further contended that as the statement of work done in each year shows that he has in no case ‘continuous service’ therefore he cannot be treated as casual worker on daily wages. I am unable to agree with any of the above contentions of the management in view of the legal position in this regard. For the purpose of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act the legislature has created legal fiction by way of Sec. 25B of the I.D. Act. Firstly Sub-section (1) of Sec. 25B of the I.D. Act lays down that the workman shall be deemed to be in continuous service ‘for a period if he is, for that period in uninterrupted service including... or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman’. In the instant case, it is crystal clear that cessation of work in every month was not due to any fault on the part of the workman but in fact it appears that the workman was given artificial breaks intentionally or because the work was not available for him, therefore on account of legal fiction he will be deemed to have been in continuous service for that period.

10. The second limb of the management's contention is that in any case in the year 1983 he did not work for 240 days. This too is fallacious. In his book 'The Law of Industrial Disputes' Fourth Edn. Vol. 2 learned Author Shri O. P. Malhotra, relying on various authorities at pages 1311-1312 has commented as under :—

"Sub-section (2) provides for a fiction to treat a workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered an uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered service for a period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in Sub-section 2(a), it is necessary to determine first the service which is complained of as 'retrenchment'. After that date is ascertained, move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favour of the workman, pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in sub-section (2), it will have to be assumed that the workman is in 'continuous service for a period of one year', and he will satisfy the eligibility qualifications enacted in Section 25B."

11. Another learned Author Shri Vithalbhai B. Patel in his book 'Law on Industrial Disputes' 3rd Edn. Vol. 1 has reiterated the above at page 757 in the following words:—

"Continuity of service does not necessarily mean that a workman must have one completed year of service in every year. It is sufficient that continuity of service exists and arises even if a workman works for the number of days specified in the section during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, because the fiction converts service of specified number of days into continuous service for one complete year."

12. Neither the management has pointed out any reason nor I see so to differ from the view of the learned Authors. In any case the wordings of the Sec. 25F also go to show that this interpretation is the only plausible interpretation.

13. On behalf of the management reliance is placed on the Recruitment Rules Ex. M/1. Clause 7(e) says that they will be selected and appointed to the number of vacancies in the order of vacancies in order of merit in which they pass the literacy test and had a minimum service of four years and sponsored by the Employment Exchange etc. Clause 9 of these very rules gave preference to ex-departmental casual labourers and part time casual labourers. Therefore burden was on the management to prove and show that they had given an opportunity to this workman that he fulfils those qualifications but no such opportunity of even literacy test appears to have been given to him. In any way, management's witness Shri Ziaul Mannan (M.W/3) has admitted that after Ex. M/1 Departmental Instructions reproduced in the office letter dated 11-1-1983 (Ex. W/3) were issued. Therefore these latest instructions will supersede the earlier instructions. These instructions Ex. W/3 had done away with the requirement of Employment Exchange and the age limit and had given various concession to casual labourers. Of course, only for persons engaged upto certain period. Therefore the principle will apply to the casual employees whose services were dispensed with even later on the principle of natural justice. However, even if I hold that the workmen does not qualify for recruitment rules Ex. M/1 and departmental instructions Ex. W/3 even then it does not effect the case of the workman. Once a workman falls into the harbour of Sec. 26F of the I.D. Act his termination for whatsoever reason amounts to retrenchment. In the case of Mohan Lal Vs. Management of M/s. Bharat Electronics Ltd. (AIR 1981 SC 1253) the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under :—

"Niceties and semantics apart, termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason

whatsoever would constitute retrenchment except in cases in the section itself ?"

In AIR 1980 SC 1215 it has been held that the discharge for not passing test for Foreman post amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act. In the instant case, admittedly the management has not complied with the provisions of Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act. Therefore the retrenchment is void ab initio.

11. The third limb of the management's contention is that his discontinuance of service, does not amount to retrenchment etc. Therefore it does not amount to an industrial dispute. I have already held that it amounts to retrenchment. Secondly Sec. 3A of the I.D. Act clearly says that where any employer discharges, dismiss, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with, or arising out of, such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute.

15. Fourth and the last contention of the management is that the management was acting in his sovereign function and the workman is neither a 'workman' nor the management an 'industry' has been repelled in the case of P&T Department Vs. Its Workmen (1984 FLR (49) 57). Since his discontinuance amounts for retrenchment it being void I answer the reference as under :—

That the action of the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Office City Division, Nagpur in relation to their Nagpur City Head Post Office in terminating/discontinuing the service of Shri P. N. Thool Postman on daily wages w.e.f. 8-8-1983 and reappointing him as E.D. Chowkidar on lower pay is not justified. As such he is entitled to be reinstated as Postman with effect from 8-8-1983 and the difference of wages/emoluments between ED Chowkidar and Postman. No order as to costs.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer

[No. 1-40012/28/83-D.II(R)]

का. आ. 3988—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा के अन्तर्गण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, सीनियर सुपरिन्टेंडेंट आर एम एस, एक विभाग, नागपुर के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच अनुबंध में, निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जवल्पुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 6-11-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3988.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Senior Superintendent RMS 'F' Division, Nagpur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th November, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(67)/1986

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of RMS 'F' Division (Indian Postal Deptt.) Saraf Chamber, Main Road, Nagpur and their workman Shri N. G. Krishnan, Lower Selection Grade Sorting Assistant represented through the Divisional Secretary. All India R.M.S. & M.M.S. Employees Union, Class III 230A, Gandhi Chowk, P & T Union Office, Sadar Nagpur-440 001.

APPEARANCES :

For Union—None.

For Management—Shri R. A. Bhavate, Office Supervisor.

INDUSTRY : P & T

DISTRICT : Nagpur (M.S.)

AWARD

Dated, the October 21, 1986

This is a reference made by the Central Government for adjudication of the following dispute, vide Notification No. L-40012/45/85-D.II(B) dated 21st August, 1986 :—

"Whether the action of the management of Senior Superintendent, RMS 'F' Division Nagpur in ordering transfer to LSG Sub-Record Officer on allowance post from Nagpur to Yavatmal of Shri N. C. Krishnan, Lower Selection Grade, Sorting Assistant and President of all India RMS & MMS Employees Union Class III 'F' Divisional Branch, Nagpur vide Memo. No. B1/7LSG/Sel/85 dated 12-8-1985 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workmen entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference order parties were noticed to file their statement of claim complete with the relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses on 30th September, 1986. Shri G. Y. Khapkar, Divisional Secretary of the Union instead of filing the pleadings intimated this Tribunal that since the issue under dispute has been settled, the dispute is not continuing (vide letter dated 2-9-1986). He has also sent a copy of the order passed by Shri V. S. Kenge, Sr. Superintendent R.M.S. 'F' Division, Nagpur. The terms of order concerning Shri N. G. Krishnan, the workman concerned, are as under :—

"Shri N. G. Krishnan JSG Str. Asstt. HRO 'F' Dn. Nagpur to be LSG Supervisor HRO 'F' Dn. Nagpur against deputation vacancy of Shri B. K. Banerjee from 1-9-86 after retirement of Shri D. M. Datar."

3. On 30-9-1986 Shri R. A. Bhavate, Office Supervisor appeared on behalf of the management and filed a statement of claim. The management besides raising some technical point confirmed the issue of the above order passed by the Sr. Superintendent R.M.S. 'F' Division, Nagpur regarding Shri Krishnan's revised posting.

4. Since the dispute has been settled between the parties there is now no dispute left for determination by this Tribunal. I therefore answer the reference in terms of the above-mentioned order passed by the Sr. Superintendent, R.M.S. 'F' Division, Nagpur. No order as to costs.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer

[No. L-40012/45/85-D.II(B)]

का. मा. 3989—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वयेण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय खाद्य निगम, नागपुर के प्रबंधक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 6-11-86 को शांत हुआ था।

S.O. 3989.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India, Nagpur and their workmen,

1117 GI/86—11

which was received by the Central Government on the 6th November, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(27)/1985

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India, Nagpur (M.S.) and their workmen represented through the Secretary, F.C.I. Employees Association, Ajni, Nagpur-15 (M.S.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union—Shri N. S. Shukla and Shri L. S. Ahuja.

For Management—Shri V. K. Alkarl.

INDUSTRY : Food Corporation

DISTRICT : Nagpur
(M.S.)

AWARD

Dated, the October 29, 1986

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-42011(8)/84/D.V. dated 11th April, 1985 for adjudication of the following dispute :—

"Whether the action of the management of Food Corporation of India, Nagpur in discontinuing to treat the Interim Relief as Wage Component for the purpose of payment of overtime with effect from 1-8-1983 is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?"

2. Non-controversial facts of the case are that the management of Food Corporation of India had taken the interim relief as part and parcel of pay for the payment of encashment of earned leave and contributory provident fund and paid the arrears after declaration of the interim relief with effect from 1st August, 1983.

3. The case of the workmen is that as per the Bombay Shops and Establishments Act, 1948 the following components of monthly emoluments are to be given for the purpose of determining the wages :—

(i) —Pay

(ii) —Dearness Allowance including dearness pay and additional D.A. granted from time to time.

(iii) —City Compensatory Allowance.

(iv) Interim Relief.

The previous declared interim relief in the year 1973 was also taken as a part and parcel of pay for all the payment including the payment of Overtime wages. The management has, however, discontinued to include the interim relief declared from 1-8-1983 for the purpose of overtime. The question of exemption from the applicability to Section 63 of Bombay Shops and Establishments Act, 1948 (hereinafter referred to Bombay Shops Act) had not yet legally been settled. Employees had challenged the Government of Maharashtra decision to give exemption to F.C.I. was challenged in Bombay High Court. Hon'ble Bombay Court gave verdict in favour of employees and the management has taken the matter to Hon'ble Supreme Court which is still pending.

3. The case of the management is that the application of Bombay Shops Act except Section 63 was exempted by Maharashtra Government in 1975. Now application of Sec. 63 has also been exempted in the year 1985 in relation to F.C.I. In any case, there is no provision in the said Act to include the interim relief for the purpose of determining wages. Interim relief granted was included under the term 'emoluments' for the purposes of overtime Allowance with the approval of Board of Directors in accordance with the

Central Government decision. Again the decision for non-including interim relief granted in the year 1973 for the purpose of overtime allowance has also been taken in accordance with the decision of the Government of India. In F.C.I. there is numerous unions and there is no consensus about the formulae for wage revision among them. While the negotiations for wage revision was going on Government granted interim relief to the employees and the management of F.C.I. followed suite in the year 1983. Thus the interim relief granted during 1983 was conditional that BPE Formulae be implemented. The other condition before release of interim relief was that Government D.A. will be frozen as on 31-7-83. The staff union filed cases against the freezing of D.A. and the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed the interim orders to pay D.A. after obtaining undertaking. As such all D.A.s have been released after obtaining the undertaking from the staff. On the other hand, various unions went up to the Supreme Court praying that further instalments of interim relief should be released on par with the Government of India employees. Hon'ble Supreme Court thereon passed interim order that two instalments of interim relief which have been declared by the Government of India shall be payable on the same basis as to the Government of India employees with effect from 1-4-1985 on an undertaking given by each employee that in case they fail in the claims made by them, they will refund the excess amount drawn. The management has also raised various other issues and I am of the opinion that I need not consider them at this stage looking to the facts of the case.

4. The question arises whether the management was justified in discontinued to treat the interim relief as wage component for the payment of overtime with effect from 1-8-83.

5. I have already narrated the facts above and the parties do not appear to be much in dispute over the facts. The contention of the management was that in relation to F.C.I. the Government of Maharashtra had exempted the operation of the said Act except Section 63 in the year 1975. In the year 1985 even the provision of Sec. 63 of the said Act were exempted in relation to F.C.I. This position is not disputed by the workmen. In fact, their pleadings are that they had filed writ against the decision of the Maharashtra Government and the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay allowed their writ. But they have also admitted that now the management has gone on appeal and the matter is still sub-judice.

6. It is further the case of the management that when interim relief was granted in 1983 subject to condition of freezing D.A. staff Union had gone up to Supreme Court and had obtained two conditional interim orders for the payment of interim relief.

7. Management have filed order in writ petition No. 17059/84, dated 5-9-1985 which is being reproduced below :—

"So far as the Food Corporation of India is concerned two instalments of the Interim Relief which have been declared by the Government of India shall be payable by the petitioners to their irrespective whether they are in Class I, Class II, Class III or Class IV on the same basis and scale as the other Government of India employees w.e.f. 1st April, 1985 on an undertaking given by each of the employee to the Food Corporation of India employees w.e.f. 1st April, 1985 on an undertaking given by each of the employee that in case they fail in the claim made by them they will refund the excess amount drawn by them to the Food Corporation of India and the Food Corporation of India will be entitled to adjust the excess against the future salary and other emoluments including retirement benefits payable to them. This order will be without prejudice to the interim relief which is already being paid by the Food Corporation of India to its employees. The arrears if any, of the two instalments of interim relief shall be paid within one month from today."

From the above it is crystal clear that the matter of application of Sec 63 or in fact the whole of the said Act is sub-judice in Supreme Court. The matter of grant of conditional interim relief is also sub-judice before the Hon'ble

Supreme Court. The matter has not been finally decided as yet. In the circumstances, the demand of the workmen to treat the D.A. for the purpose of overtime is premature. For this very reason the contention of the workmen that according to the order of the management of the F.C.I. dated 2-4-1985 (Ex. W1) payment of overtime allowance as per the said Act was ordered, therefore they are entitled to the same specially when they were being granted the same as is apparent from the order Ex. M1 of 1973 is futile. Ex. W1 clearly goes to show that this order was passed in view of the Bombay High Court's verdict which admittedly is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in appeal.

8. In view of the above I answer the reference as under :

That the claim of the workmen is premature. Therefore they are not entitled to any relief with respect to treat the Interim Relief as Wage component for the purpose of payment of overtime with effect from 1-8-1983 at this stage of the case. However, they will be free to move the matter when both the above writs are decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. No order as to costs.

Dated : 29-10-1986.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer
[No. L-42011/84-D.V/D.II(B)]
HARI SINGH, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 नवम्बर, 1986

का. अ. 3990.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, कार्बोरंडम यूनिवर्सल लि., भाटिया, जिला—जाम-नगर के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अग्रुव में निम्नित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 4-11-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1986

S.O. 3990.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Carborandum Universal Limited, Bhatia, Distt. Jamnagar and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI G. S. BAROT, PRESIDING OFFICER,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT
AHMEDABAD

Reference (ITC) No. 5 of 1986

ADJUDICATION

BETWEEN

The Management of Carborandum Universal Ltd., Bhatia
(Gujarat).

AND

The workmen employed under it.

In the matter of suspension of Shri S. Kumaran, Mines
Attendant, Rajatalav.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between the Management of Carborandum Universal Limited, Bhatia (Gujarat) and the workmen employed under it has been referred to me for adjudication as a Presiding Officer under Section 10 (1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, by the Under Secretary to Government of India, Ministry of Labour's Order No. L-29012(48)/84-D.II(B) dated 18-2-1986.

2. The dispute relates to a single demand which is as under :—

"Whether the action of the management of Carborandum Universal Limited, Bhatia (Distt. Jamnagar) in suspending Shri S. Kumaran, Mines Attendant, Rajatalav and not paying his wages for the period from 25-8-83 to 28-8-83 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

3. Before this reference can be heard and finally disposed of, Shri S. Kumaran, the workman concerned has filed the purshis Ex. 10 wherein it is stated that as he has amicably settled the matter with the Management, he would like to unconditionally withdraw his claim against the Company. The demand is allowed to be withdrawn and the reference is disposed of accordingly.

Ahmedabad;

Dated : 8th October, 1986

G. S. BAROT, Presiding Officer
[No. L-29012/48/84-D. III(B)]

का. आ. 3991.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मचकोट डोलोमाइट प्रोजेक्ट, पोरट जगदलपुर (म.प्र.) के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जगदलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करता है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 4-11-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3991.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Machkot Dolomite Project, P. O. Jagdalpur (M. P.) and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(99)/1984

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Machkot Dolomite Project, P. O. Jagdalpur (M. P.) and their workmen Sarvashri G. T. Thimoji Rao and H. Kotralah, represented through the Metal Mine Workers' Union Machkot Dolomite Project, Bailadila Bhawan, Geedam Road, Jagdalpur (Bastar) (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union.—Shri G. Thimoji Rao.

For Management.—Shri R. Menon, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Dolomite Mining. DISTRICT : Jagdalpur (Bastar) M. P.

AWARD

Dated, October 27, 1986

This is a reference made by the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-29012/43/84-D. III(B) dated 4th December, 1984, for adjudication of the following dispute :—

"Whether the action of the management of Machkot Dolomite Project, P. O. Jagdalpur in not placing

Sarvashri G. Thimoji Rao and H. Kotralah, in the scale of Rs. 300-7-384 from the date of their appointment was justified, if not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled and from what date?"

2. In this case the Union filed their pleadings on 25-1-1985 and the management on 3-7-1985 and thereafter dates were fixed for filing of documents and evidence of parties and also for arguments. But the parties instead of adducing evidence filed a compromise petition on 19-9-1986 after seeking several adjournments in between July 1985 to September, 1986. The terms of settlement, duly signed by Shri Man Mohan Singh, Sr. Personnel Manager (IR) on behalf of the management and Shri G. Thimoji Rao, MMW Union, Akaltara Branch on behalf of the workmen concerned, are as under :—

1. That Shri G. Thimoji Rao and H. Kotralah will be designated as Chairman and placed in the time scale of Rs. 300-7-384 w.e.f. 24-11-1983 (since revised to Rs. 565-13-656-15-761) i.e. the date on which the dispute was raised by the Union and the arrears will be paid to them accordingly w.e.f. 24-11-83.

2. That the above term of settlement is in full and final settlement between the parties. No claim whatsoever will be preferred by the workmen union for placement of the incumbents in the scale of Rs. 300-7-384 (revised to Rs. 565-13-656-15-761) for the back period including seniority.

3. That the above settlement has been entered into by the management only with a view to maintain industrial peace and harmony and as a gesture of goodwill and this settlement shall not be taken as a precedent by the Union.

3. I have gone through the terms of settlement arrived at between the parties and I am of the opinion that the terms are fair, reasonable and are in the interest of the workmen. Therefore I record my award in terms of the settlement mentioned above without any order as to costs.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer

[No. L-29012/43/84-D. III(B)]

का. आ. 3992.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, डोलोमाइट आयर्न और प्रोजेक्ट अफ नेशनल मिनरल डेवलपमेंट कार्पोरेशन, डोलोमाइट (कर्नाटक) के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलूर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करता है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-10-86 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3992.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Donimalai Iron Ore Project of National Mineral Development Corporation, Donimalai (Karnataka) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 31st October, 1986.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL IN KARNATAKA, BANGALORE

Dated this the 22nd day of October, 1986

PRESENT :

Sri. R. Ramakrishna, B.A., B.L., Presiding Officer.
Central Reference No. 5 of 1980

I PARTY

Workmen represented,
by the General Secretary,
Donimalai Iron,
Ore Project Employees,
Association, Donimalai,
Town Ship, Post 583118.

II PARTY

The General Manager,
Donimalai Iron Ore pro-
ject of M/s. National
Mineral Development
Corporation, Donimalai,
Township, Post 583118.

II (a) The Management of,
National Mineral Development
Corporation represented,
by its Chairman, Head Office,
Hyderabad-500004,
6-3-653, Somajgude.

APPEARANCES :

For the I Party.—Sri K. Subba Rao, Advocate, Banga-
lore.

For the II Party.—Sri. S. S. Ram Das, Advocate, Banga-
lore.

REFERENCE :

(Government Order No. L-26011/6/78-D. III. B. dt.
24-10-79)

AWARD

The Central Government in exercise the powers conferr-
ed by section 7-A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of
Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred
this dispute for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the Union for promotion of
Shri K. T. Alexander as Design Assistant with
effect from 23-8-1976 on the basis of the common
seniority list dated 19-4-1973 is justified? If so,
to what relief is he entitled?"

2. After filing of the claim statement and counter state-
ment the I Party have filed an application under Section
11(1) read with Section 18(3)(b) of the Industrial Dis-
putes Act, to implead the II(a) party as a necessary party
to this dispute. After allowing the said application II(a)
party has been impleaded and they have also filed their
counter statement.

3. The General Secretary of the I Party Association has
filed the claim statement contending thereon that this
association is a registered trade union and almost all the
workmen employed in the Donimalai Iron Ore Project
belonging to the National Mineral Development Corporation
Limited (herein after referred to as 'the Corporation') are
the members of this Association. The Association represents
the I Party workmen, who are employed in the Project.

4. It is further contended that the workmen Sri. K. T.
Alexander, is an active member of the Association and his
case has been espoused by the Association. A demand was
made by the Association on behalf of the I Party workmen
that he should be promoted from the post of Senior
Draughtsman to the Post of Design Assistant with effect
from 23-8-1976, on the basis of a common seniority list
dated 19-4-73. This common seniority list of all the Senior

Draughtsman was prepared and a circular was issued from
the Head Office bearing No. ADMM(SN)/139/72 dated
19-4-73. This workman is the senior-most person in the
category of Senior Draughtsman as per this list. That the
corporation is a Government of India Undertaking with
establishments at different places and carrying on project
work as well as mining and construction work. The II Party
project is also a project belonging to the Corporation which
commenced the commercial production of iron ore during
the year 1970-81.

5. Sri. K. T. Alexander joined the service from 3-8-63
at Bailadila—Deposit 14 Project Iron Ore Project as a
Draughtsman Grade I. Subsequently, he was promoted as
a Senior Draughtsman on or about 23-3-67 and was trans-
ferred to Bailadila Deposit 5 Project as Senior Draughtsman
and from there to Donimalai during July, 1976. He had
unblemished and excellent service throughout and second
senior-most person in the category of senior draughtsman.
The Post of senior draughtsman is a transferable post and it
was open to the corporation to transfer an employee from
one project to another including to its head office situated
at Hyderabad. In the common seniority list of senior
draughtsmen, the name of Alexander was at serial No. 2,
on the all-India basis of the Corporation. However, on
23-8-76, two senior Draughtsman of the head office Sri
A. K. Majumdar and Inarajit Singh, who were juniors to
Sri Alexander were promoted overlooking to his seniority.
Immediately a representation was submitted for the great
injustice due to promotion of his juniors and therefore, Sri
Alexander was subjected to invidious and hostile discrimina-
tion. In addition to this promotion the corporation also
promoted Sri. B. K. Chakravathy and Sri. Lallan Prasad
to Kirubur Project and Meghahathaburu Project respectively,
as Design Assistants. To the representation of the Alexander
the corporation in its reply dated 2-3-77, had admitted
that he was the senior but stated that each of the Head
of the Establishment had been given power to promote
senior draughtsman to the post of design assistant taking
into consideration Unit-wise seniority of the concerned pro-
ject and rejected the representation of Sri. Alexander.

6. It is further contended that seniority list of senior
draughtsman is prepared and maintained on the basis of a
combined seniority for the entire corporation and all the
promotions to the higher posts are based upon the said
seniority list. Whenever a vacancy of a Design Assistant
arises, promotions have to be made on the basis of the
combined seniority list. Therefore when the juniors were
promoted, the case of Sri. Alexander should have been
considered and he should have been promoted as a Design
Assistant. The fact that such promotions had to be effected
on the basis of the combined seniority list is clear from the
fact that the management of the corporation maintained
such a list, because it treated all senior draughtsmen and
posts above as posts which have to be filled from the
combined seniority list of all the projects and the Head
Office. That is a service condition applicable to the work-
men of the corporation. It is on the basis of such a com-
bined seniority list, Sri Alexander was transferred from
Bailadila to Donimalai. If untimely seniority had been
maintained, then he was not liable to be transferred. Because
of the combined seniority, he was liable to be transferred
anywhere from project to project including the head office.
When the seniority of the Sri Alexander was overlooked he
complained to the association which took up the matter
before the management and subsequently before the As-
sistant Regional Labour Commissioner, Hyderabad and the
conciliation was ended in failure on account of unreasonable
stand taken by the corporation.

7. It is further contended that the action of the manage-
ment is discriminatory, unjust and contrary to his service
conditions. When a common and a combined seniority list
was maintained, a departure was made by overlooking the
seniority Sri. Alexander. This departure is violative of
the provisions of Section 9-A of the Act. If the case of
the corporation was that subsequent to the preparation of
the combined seniority list powers were delegated to the

head of the project or to the concerned General Managers to promote persons on the basis of unit-wise seniority, it amounts to a variation of service condition to the detriment of the workman. Admittedly no notice was given under Section 9-A of the Act. It is further contended that this workman was discriminated and was victimised as he was an active member of the employees' association. The case of the Corporation that the concerned General Managers were delegated with the powers of promotion within the units upto the grade of Rs. 650—1200 is clearly an afterthought which was taken to defeat the legitimate claim of the workman. It is further contended that his case was not considered for further promotion even within the unit of Donimalai, even though there were vacancies.

8. Wherefore the I Party prayed to pass an award directing the II Party to promote Sri. Alexander as Design Assistant with effect from 23-8-76, the date on which, his immediate juniors were promoted and further to grant all the consequential benefits including financial, seniority and other reliefs.

9. The II Party in their counter statement initially questioned the jurisdiction of this Tribunal on the ground that Sri K. T. Alexander is not a workman at the relevant time and even now as he is working as a senior draftsman in a supervisory capacity. His present salary exceeds Rs. 500 per month. Hence he is not a workman as defined by Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Further, the promotions are not one of the matters specified in Schedule-2 and cannot be claimable as of right. The question depends not only on the length of service but also on his performance, qualification and availability of posts. These are essentially matters which are with the exclusive discretion of the management and cannot be an industrial disputes.

10. It is further contended that M/s. National Mineral Development Corporation (NMDC) is a Government Company under the Companies Act, engaged in mining and exploratory work. Under NMDC there are several units namely Bailadila-14, Bailadila-5, Panna and feasibility. Recruitment, promotion and seniority was being considered unitwise. At one stage, there was a proposal to have a common seniority list in respect of employees in all the units together and in pursuance of such proposal a provisional seniority list was prepared. But this proposal on a review was given up. Consequently the pre-existing position of treating each unit as a separate entity for purposes of recruitment, seniority and promotion got restored. In the provisional common seniority list Sri. Alexander was shown above A. K. Majumdar and Indrajit Singh of the Head Office. But when the proposal to draw up a common seniority list was dropped, the question of Sri. Alexander claiming to be senior to the said employees did not arise, as they were in a different unit namely head office. There was no promotional vacancy at the Donimalai and hence Alexander could not be promoted. Hence the grievance that A. K. Majumdar and Indrajit Singh were promoted is misconceived because they are in the head office wherein there was a promotional vacancy for which promotion had to be considered from among the employees of that unit on the basis of seniority of that unit.

11. Sri. B. K. Chakraborti and Sri. Lallan Prasad, both were promoted on the basis of seniority lists for those units against the vacancies that became available in those units. Subsequently the projects in which they were working, were transferred to M/s. Steel Authority of India Ltd. their services were permanently transferred and they are no longer the employees of NMDC.

12. It is further contended that in the absence of a promotional post of Design Assistant the question of considering Sri. K. T. Alexander does not arise. He will be considered when a post is available. Therefore there is no ground or score for raising a dispute now. After denying the other material allegations made by the I Party it is further contended that Section 9-A has no application and Sri. Alexander not being a workman he is not entitled to any notice. Hence they prayed for rejection of the dispute.

13. The II Party who were subsequently impleaded have contended in their statement that they are not a necessary party to this dispute and the reference in so far as

it relates to this party be rejected. They have further contended as a matter of policy, promotions to posts in the pay scales of Rs. 700—1300 and above and posts in the scale of Rs. 650—1200 and above and posts in materials management, General Administration and accounts are filled by Head Office on a centralised basis irrespective of whether they are working in the Head Office or any other project unit in accordance with the Central Seniority lists published by NMDC. All other posts in grades equivalent to class II are to be filled up by promotions by Heads of projects General Managers in each of the aforesaid project units on unitwise basis as per the powers delegated to them. Thus when there is a vacancy available for being filled up by promotions in any of the technical disciplines in the class II or below, the General Manager fills it up by promotion from out of the employees in the next lower grade working in his project only. Employees working in other projects units are not considered, nor they are eligible to be considered.

14. It is further contended that to prepare a centralised seniority list of all the employees who are eligible for being promoted to class I, NMDC calls for particulars of the employees in the next lower grades like foreman (mechanical and Electrical) etc. who may be serving in any of the project units of NMDC. It is with this intention that NMDC called for particulars as per circular dated 14-8-82. The object was to collect particulars and publish the seniority list on a centralised basis to consider their promotions posts in grade 400—950 (revised to Rs. 700—1300), equivalent to Class I, the promotion of which could be made by NMDC, Head Office only on the basis of centralised seniority list. Sri. Alexander could not have been promoted on the basis of seniority list dated 19-4-73 as his promotional post was not in the pay scale of Rs. 400—950 (pre-revised) but only Rs. 350—900 (pre-revised). The centralised seniority list was prepared for consideration to the next higher grade of Rs. 400—950 (Rs. 700—1300 revised). The post of design assistant which is the next promotional post of Sri. Alexander is in a lower scale of pay of Rs. 350—900 (revised to Rs. 650—1200).

15. It is further contended that the powers of the General Manager to make appointments/promotions were restricted to the posts and pay scales of which did not exceed Rs. 900 then again restricted Rs. 890 and after review it was increased to Rs. 900 (revised to Rs. 1200) from 27-9-1975.

16. It is further contended that the Alexander was working as a senior draftsman in the scale of pay Rs. 490—838. His promotional post was Design Assistant in the pay scale of Rs. 350—900 (revised to Rs. 650—1200) which was lower than class I post and so the promotions could have been done only by the General Manager of the concerned unit. Donimalai unit was sanctioned the post of Design Assistant as per office order dated 2-1-82 and Alexander was considered for this post with effect from 1-2-82 and he has been working in the said post from that day. Since the promotion to Design Assistant came within the competency of the General Manager of the unit, the I Party cannot take objection on the ground that he ought to have been promoted earlier on the basis of common seniority list.

17. It is further contended that Sri. Alexander was transferred from Bailadila-5 to Donimalai Iron ore Project, as he became surplus. There are no other ulterior motives involved. The claim of the I Party that he is entitled for promotion only on the basis of common seniority list dated 19-4-73 is untenable and misconceived. The contention that if unitwise seniority had to be maintained, he was not liable to be transferred and that it is because of combined seniority that he was liable to be transferred from project to project including head office are untenable. Hence they prayed for rejecting the reference.

18. My learned predecessor determined that no additional issues and noted the case for the evidence on the points of dispute referred by the Government. The aggrieved workman has examined himself as WW-1 and closed this case. On behalf of the I Party the documents Ext. W-1 to W-23

are marked on behalf of the II Party, three witnesses have been examined and documents Ext. M-1 to M-22 are marked.

19. With regard to the question of jurisdiction of are this Tribunal to entertain this reference on the ground the change of Presiding Officers of this Tribunal, when this dispute was referred in the name of a presiding officer who was available at the time of the reference, the counsels have not pressed this point. Further, it is the practice of this Tribunal to get fresh notifications as and when a presiding Officer changes, there is absolutely no merit in the contentions raised by the II Party on this point. Though the Second party have contended the question of promotion are within the inclusive discretion of the management, hence the same cannot be treated as industrial dispute, again there is no evidence to substantiate this stand taken by the II Party. Coming to the next point, the II Party have contended that the workman Mr. Alexander is being posted in a supervisory capacity and consequently he is not a workman has also not proved by placing any evidence. But however, it is proved by the I Party that he was a workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the Act, in his evidence which was not denied by the II Party in the cross-examination.

20. With regard to the main points of dispute the affected workman deposed that he was working as a senior draughtsman and was entitled to be promoted as design assistant as from 23-8-76 on the basis of common seniority list Ext. W-1 dated 19-4-73. He was appointed as per Ext. W-2 on 3-8-63 and the II Party had several branches in different States and the employees are transferable from one place to another. Donimalai Project is a unit of NMDC. He was appointed by the General Manager of Bailadila Iron Ore projects NMDC at Madhya Pradesh and later he was transferred to Deposit No. 5 and thereafter to Donimalai in July 1976 as senior draughtsman. The promotion was to be given on seniority-cum-merit basis and in August 1976 serial No. 6 & 7 in Ext. W-1 were promoted ignoring his seniority then he gave representations as per Ext. W-3, W-4 & W-5 and received replies as per Ext. W16 and W-7 rejecting his requests.

21. He has further deposed that his request for a transfer to the Head Office at Hyderabad was not considered and again in 1977 the persons at serial No. 4 and 5 in Ext. W-1 were promoted at Orissa and Bihar and as per the seniority list Ext. W-1 he was entitled to an earlier promotion than the persons juniors to him.

22. In June 1978 the Donimalai Project seniority list was prepared for that unit only after he raised a dispute as per Ext. W-12. He has further deposed that he was one of the voters for the works committee of the union and he was also a workman as per the settlement Ext. W-19 and he does not know the reasons why the promotion was denied to him.

23. In the cross-examination of this witness, it is elicited by the II Party that at present he was working as a design assistant from 1-2-82 and he was the senior most at Donimalai and his juniors were not promoted by overlooking his seniority. He has claimed the promotion from 23-8-76 on the basis of Ext. W-1. The scale of pay of a design assistant is Rs. 650 to 1200 and there is only one post of a design assistant at Donimalai. There are 3 or 4 posts of the same scale of General Foreman, Assistant Personnel Officers etc. He has denied the suggestion that earlier the promotions were made on the basis of unitwise seniority and he is not aware that promotion was not given to him due to want of vacancy. He was not an office bearer of the union and only an ordinary member and he has been transferred to Donimalai Project after the construction work at Bailadila had come to an end.

24. Against this evidence, the 1st witness for the management, one personnel manager of Donimalai has deposed that at Donimalai he is working from last 15 years and prior to that he was the Administrative Officer in the Head Office at Hyderabad. The chairman has power to sub-delegate his powers and that schedule of powers which are delegated to the chairman by the Board of Directors. Ext. M-1 is the office order under which the Directors. Ext. M-1 is the office order under which the General Manager/Hence of Project were sub-delegated with persons to appoint

directly and by promotion to the post on scales of pay the maximum of which is Rs. 900/- per month. Ext. M-2 is the modified order under which the power for appointment to the Heads of office was restricted to upto Rs. 890 per month. In the year 1975 an amendment was issued decentralising the powers that is sub-delegating the powers to the heads of project for appointment to post on scales of pay the maximum of which is Rs. 1200/- per month, Ext. M-3 is the order. Pay scales were revised from time to time as per the reasons stated in Ext. M-4. The pay scales of Rs. 490 to 950 was Class I post for which promotion is to be made on central list by the Head Office. So in the year 1972 the head office asked to the list of persons is various designations carrying pay scales of Rs. 350 to 900 as stated in Ext. M-5. In pursuance of this Ext. W-1 was prepared after compiling the reports from the different units for promotion to the posts in the scale of Rs. 400 to 950 and above.

25. He has further deposed that after Ext. M-3 was issued, the Heads of projects were promoted to consider the cases of employees working in the projects for promotion to the scale of Rs. 650 to 1200/- which is the scale of pay for design assistant. After the issue of the order of the year 1975 the Alexander could not have been considered for promotion to any other project or head office as a unit. Kiriburu and Meghabatapur project are transferred to Steel Authority of India, where the promotions of two juniors officers were made and Alexander has not been considered as he was working in another unit.

26. In the cross-examination of this witness it is elicited that the Donimalai project entered into production stage in 1977. In 1973 there was a common seniority list circulated by the Head Office for the posts of senior draughtsmen and there is no subsequent order cancelling or withdrawing it. Prior to the transfer of the two projects under Ext. M-6 there were some promotions made of the senior draughtsmen in those units. Some of the transfers were made during that time was on compassionate basis and mutual. As per rules employees are transferrable from one place to any other place in India. If senior draughtsman is transferred from any unit from the head office. His further promotions should be made as per the seniority list in the Head Office. The senior draughtsmen were working in electrical, mechanical and civil and mining department and there was a common seniority list for them. A senior draughtsman will be promoted as a design assistant and he may be asked to work in any of the fields of mechanical, electrical, civil or mine depending upon their experience. A general manager can make appointments in regard to his units in the scale of Rs. 650 to 1200.

27. MW-2 has materially corroborated the evidence of MW-1. In addition he has stated that Ext. W-13 is the corporate seniority list wherein one Mangatram at Serial No. 7 was promoted as a General Foreman and serial Nos. 1 to 6 were not considered for promotion as they were not working at Donimalai. As per Ext. M-9 and M-10 five posts of senior draughtsmen were sanctioned and out of eleven draughtsmen working one post was upgraded as design assistant and Sri Alexander was promoted by the promotion committee, as he was senior and found fit for promotion.

28. That last witness Mr. Guruswamy working in the corporation unit has deposed that he joined NMDC in 1977 as Assistant Personnel Manager and promoted in the year 1981. The employees are transferable to one to another and Ext. M-11 is a recruitment and promotion Rules. He has further deposed that for Class-I posts of Rs. 700 to Rs. 1300 promotions are made at Head Office level on common seniority list of all the unions. For Class-II posts of Rs. 650 to Rs. 1200 promotions are made by Head Office on a common seniority basis for non-technical posts. But for technical posts the promotions are made at the units based on the individual units seniority and the vacancies existing. Ext. M-5 was issued in the Head Office in regard to promotions to Class-I posts, which had a scale of pay

of Rs. 400 to 950 at that time now revised to Rs. 700 to 1800. The seniority list Ext. W-1 was issued in pursuance of the circular Ext. M-5, no promotions were made to the posts of senior draughtsman under Ext. W-1. The seniority that an employee have in a particular unit will be carried by him in case of transfer to another unit. The 1 party workman was transferred from Bailadila unit to Donimalai as per Ext. M-12 and M-13. One Bhattacharya who was working at Bailadila project who was a junior to Alexander was promoted in August, 1982 as per Ext. M-14. Mazumdar and Indrajit Singh were promoted on the basis of seniority list maintained at Head Office and based on the existing of vacancies.

29. In the cross examination of this witness that a Bailadila 5 Unit there were two senior draughtsman and the Alexander who was the seniormost in that project. Sri Alexander was transferred to No. 5 from No. 14 project. The individual project will report about the surplus in their project and there is no prescribed policy as to how the surplus staff should be absorbed. The convention is to report to other projects and there is no guidelines prescribed to determine the surplus in each project. Bhattacharya who continued at Bailadila-5 project was promoted in August, 1982, his seniority was at serial No. 3 in Ext. W-1. The reasons for transfer of a senior hand to another project is to give him an opportunity to have a promotion in the new project. Ext. W-1 is not cancelled. There is no specific instruction from the Head Office as to how and when the transfers are to be made.

30. The Learned counsel for the I Party Sri G. S. Rao has submitted that the II Party disregarding the seniority of Mr. Alexander as shown in Ext. W-1 have admittedly promoted some juniors in that list which is legally untenable. Though the II Party have contended that the promotions were made on the basis of the seniority of a unit, there is no circular were issued and Ext. W-1 was not withdrawn, cancelled or substituted and no unitwise promotion list was produced. The learned counsel further submitted that the service conditions of all the employees are governed by DNMC and General Manager had no power to grant promotions and only the Chairman had the authority, hence it cannot be said that the promotions were made on unitwise seniority. He has further submitted that if the management would have been transferred Mr. Alexander to Hyderabad as per his request he would have got early promotions on the basis of his seniority.

31. Against this submission the learned counsel for the second parties Sri S. S. Ramdas has submitted that the only basis claimed for a promotion by this workman is under Ext. W-1 and there is no evidence of malafides or victimisation on the part of the II Party. He has further submitted when Mr. Alexander was transferred to Donimalai he accepted the transfer carrying his service to that unit. The learned counsel further submitted that his transfer was made on the basis of necessity due to surplus age at Bailadila project and as per the various circulars under delegations of powers the Head Office had retained the promotions of some category of the workmen and the category under which Mr. Alexander comes has been left to the unit heads to make promotions in the pay scale of Rs. 600 to Rs. 1200 and accordingly this workman was promoted in 1982 when a post is created of a design assistant for which he was the seniormost, found suitable. The learned counsel further submitted that since no malafides attributed to the II Party the claim of the workman is legally unsustainable. The learned counsel further submitted that this workman is not entitled to question his transfer to Donimalai in this dispute and any decision in this regard will enlarge the scope of points of dispute and such a course cannot be taken as per the various decisions on this point. The learned counsels have placed their reliance on various decisions we will advert to some of the important decision which have a direct bearing on the facts and circumstances of this case. Since the question of malafides and victimisation being not proved in this case, we have to proceed on the basis whether the management were justified in promoting some of the juniors to that of Mr. Alexander as per the promotion norms governing the promotions policies.

32. The learned counsel for the I Party has relied on a decision reported in 1982 Lab. I.C. 33, Supreme Court judgment. In this case when promotions and upgradations were made indiscriminately by the management disregarding the claims of some employees who are senior and equally placed. Their Lordships have held :

"Although promotion/upgradation is a managerial function, it must not be on the subjective satisfaction of the management but must be on some objective criteria.

If there are grades and scope of upgradation/promotion and there are different scales of pay for different grades in private undertaking, and, in fact, promotion is given or upgradation is made, there should be no arbitrary or unjust and reasonable upgradation or promotion of persons superseding the claims of persons who may be equally or even more, suitable."

33. Their Lordships further held that :

"Even if promotion may not be a condition of service in a private company and promotion may be the function of the management, it may be recognised that there may be occasions where the Tribunal may have to cancel the promotions made by the management where it is felt that persons superseded have been so superseded on account of legal malafide or victimization. AIR 1966 SC 663.

Held on facts that although the union had not been able to prove factual malafide, in this case malice in law and effectual victimisation were obvious due to the fact that unjustified promotions of some junior persons were made superseding, without any reason or necessity, the cases of a large number of senior persons."

34. The II Party to justify the action taken by them have relied on decisions reported in 1966 (1) I.L.J. 402 and 1968 Lab. I.C. 82.

35. In 1966 (1) I.L.J. 402, Brooke Bond (India) Ltd., the facts are that the management have promoted some junior employees superseding some of the senior employees. When a dispute was raised, The Industrial Tribunal has set aside the promotions made by the management and directed to promote the concerned five employees from the date on which the other two employees were promoted by the management with all the consequential benefits. When this finding was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court to a larger bench consisted of five judges including His Lordship Chief Justice. It was held :

"Generally speaking, promotion is a management function; but, it may be recognized that there may be occasions when a tribunal may have to interfere with promotions made by the management where it is felt that persons superseded have been so superseded on account of mala fides or victimization. Even so after a finding of malafides or victimization, it is not the function of a tribunal to consider the merits of various employees itself and then decide whom to promote or who not to promote. If any industrial tribunal finds that promotions have been made which are unjustified on the ground of mala fides or of victimization, the proper course for it to take is to set aside the promotions and ask the management to consider the cases of superseded employees and decide for itself whom to promote, except of course the person whose promotion has been set aside by the tribunal."

36. In 1968 Lab. I. C. 82 a decision from Patna High Court, when a similar question of promotions came for consideration, relying on the decisions of Brooke Bond India Limited. Their Lordships have held that :

"It is well settled that whether a particular employee should be promoted from one grade to higher grade depends not only on the length of service but also on his efficiency and other qualifications for the post, to which he seeks to be promoted; and, in the matter of promotion, the intimate knowledge of the higher authority empowered to promote, has a greater value. In absence of a clear proof, of malafides of discrimination on extraneous grounds on the part of the Management, it would be wholly inappropriate for any outside authority to attempt to weigh the relevant merits of the individuals who might be holding the higher post and those who are aspiring for the same. Moreover, the determination of the size of the working force is the exclusive right of the management, and it is only when it is shown that the management is working with less men than necessary, that the workmen who are over-worked can claim that the working force be increased. If, therefore the management is within the rights to fill a particular vacancy, it is difficult to appreciate how the non-exercising of that right can be described as an unfair labour practice on its part. AIR 1966 SC 668, Poll."

37. The ratio decedent of the decision cited by the management in short is that in the absence of a clear proof of malafides, victimisations or discriminations on extraneous grounds, it would be wholly inappropriate for any outside authority to interfere with such promotions. The Supreme Court went a further step by directing the tribunals that it cannot set aside the promotions already made but only ask the management to consider the cases of superseded employees.

38. On a scrutiny of the evidence adduced in this case, there is absolutely no case made out by the I party of any victimisation, favouritism or discrimination on the part of the management. The direct case made out by the management is that since the promotions to the second grade of employees, which is at present a grade of Rs. 600 to Rs. 1200 was delegated to the unit officers and further the promotions to this grade was being made on the basis of a seniority maintained in a unit their act of promotions or bonafide, and a provisional list made with regard to the posts of senior draughtsman as per Ext. W-1 was not considered due to the policy of the corporation. The grievance of the union appears to be that since the seniority provisional list Ext. W-1 made on all India basis either withdrawn or cancelled, this workman being a senior most to other four persons promoted subsequently he has got a right to claim this promotion. The oral evidence adduced before this Tribunal by the witnesses for the management has cleared this point in its entirety and this Tribunal do not find any malafides on the part of the II Party in not promoting the I Party workman in accordance with the provisional list Ext. W-1. It is also in evidence that some of his juniors who have been promoted to the post of Design Assistant were working in different units, where there was a post and the incumbents had seniority in that unit.

39. The documents produced and marked by the II Party made this point clear as transfer of the I Party workman was made to Donimalai Project as he along with some other employees shown Ext. M-12 and M-13 were surplus at Bailadila Project. Since there was no post of a design assistant at Donimalai, which is a next promotional post for a senior draughtsman, the promotion of this workman was considered after creating a post at Donimalai Project and accordingly he was promoted in 1982. Though the transfer of this workman to Donimalai Project has prevented him to get a promotion as per the provisional seniority list Ext. W-1, since that list was not considered, his promotion was postponed. Though it is unfortunate that this workman has deprived of an early promotion due to his transfer, since there is no material that his transfer was actuated with any motive on the part of the II Party, this Tribunal now cannot interfere with the promotions made to some of his junior officers in the year 1976. In view of the above discussions I pass the following award;

AWARD

The demand of the I Party union for promotion of Sri K. T. Alexander, as design assistant with effect from 23-8-1976 on the basis of the common seniority list dated 19-4-73 is not justified and consequently the reference is rejected. In the circumstances, the parties shall bear their own costs.

(Dictated to the stenographer, transcribed and typed by her and corrected by me).

R. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-26011/678-D.III(B)]

का. अ. 3993.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) के धारा 17 के अनुकरण में, केन्द्र सरकार, श्री. तिनैयंग कान्तरज, कं. लिमिटेड, रामागुडम डिविजन-II, पो. गोंदावर खान, जिला-करम नगर (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) के प्रबंध वक्ता से सम्बद्ध विवादों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के विवाद को प्रस्तुत करने हेतु, जो केन्द्र सरकार को 4-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3993.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division-II, P.O. Godavari Khani, Distt. Karimnagar (A.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4-11-1986.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 60 of 1985

BETWEEN

The Workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division-II, P.O. Godavari Khani, Distt. Karimnagar.

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division-II, P.O. Godavari Khani, Distt. Karimnagar.

APPEARANCES :

Sarvasri A. K. Jayaprakash Rao, P. Damodar Reddy and K. Vijaya Kumar, Advocate for the Workmen.

Sarvasri K. Srinivasa Murthy, H. K. Saigal and Miss G. Sudha, Advocates for the Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-22012(64)/84-D.III(B) dated 3/10th September, 1985 referred under Sections 10(1)(d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, and their workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division II, P.O. Godavari Khani Distt. Karimnagar (A.P.) are justified in dismissing Sri Salignetti Narasiah, Hawler Khola, GDK 6A Incline from service w.e.f. 26-10-1983? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned is entitled?"

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 60 of 1985 and notices were issued to both the parties.

2. The claims statement filed by the workmen it is mentioned that the Petitioner Salinganti Narasiah, Hauler Khalasi is a member of the Petitioner—Union and he was dismissed from service by the Respondent with effect from 26-10-1983 and the Union is espousing his cause. The Respondent issued a charge sheet dated 20-8-1983 alleging that the workman S. Narasinha on 20-8-1983 in the second shift instigated and encouraged the other employees to abuse the shift Head Overman and assaulted him with a spade and called upon him to explain his action. The Petitioner before submitted his explanation to the charge sheet, the Respondent directed the workman to appear for enquiry on 26-8-1983. According to the Union, the said conduct would establish that the Management pre-determined to take disciplinary action against the delinquent employee and imposed the punishment of dismissal. It is also pointed out that the appointment of an Enquiry Officer to conduct the enquiry is an empty formality. As they had already determined to dismiss him from service. When the workman denied the allegations and when the enquiry was conducted as a formality and when enquiry is staged managed without giving him full and fair opportunity and when he was denied the opportunity of taking the assistance of his co-employee to participate effectively in the domestic enquiry. It must be held that the domestic enquiry is not properly held. As he is not acquainted with the formalities of the enquiry, he wanted the assistance of co-employee and the enquiry is not held in the language which is known to the concerned employee he had not assigned any reason disbelieving the workman and other witness who were examined. The order of dismissal issued on 26-10-83 is vitiated as having taken into consideration the past record of the workman. The legal evidence placed before the Enquiry Officer or even before the Tribunal did not establish the charges levelled against him. Therefore it is requested that the said order should be declared as illegal, unjust and contrary to law and he should be reinstated with continuity of service with full back wages.

3. The Management on the other hand filed a counter on 18-8-1986 denying allegations it is asserted that Sri S. Narasiah misconducted as per the Standing Orders of the Company and a charge sheet dated 22-8-1983 for which Sri S. Narasiah gave explanation on 25-8-1983 and Sri Balaram Prasad was appointed as Enquiry Officer and conducted the enquiry regarding the misconduct committed by the workman, he was given full and fair opportunity as per the principles of natural justice. He also participated in the enquiry. The Management after perusing the findings of the Enquiry Officer and after having gone through the records passed the dismissal order.

4. The Petitioner committed grave misconduct which warranted the punishment of dismissal, the allegations made by the Petitioner to put to strict proof. The other contention that the Enquiry is an empty formality is not correct. It is absurd to say that the Management conducted the enquiry to punish and dismiss and it is a staged managed enquiry. In fact, the Enquiry Officer asked him whether he will participate himself and the delinquent himself said that he would participate in the enquiry and signed the proceedings and he never asked for any assistance of a co-worker. The Petitioner never raised any objection during the course of enquiry and only after the completion of the enquiry for the first time raised the objection that he did not know to read and write English. Though the entire proceedings were read over and explained to him in Telugu from English. There is no error apparent on the findings recorded as alleged by the Petitioner. The correction made in the enquiry report were all done in the presence of the workmen itself. The validity of the domestic enquiry may be decided as a preliminary issue as he raised it. The Company had no knowledge that he is an active trade Unionist the punishment given by the Management is proportionate to the misconduct.

5. It is interesting to note that the reference was made by the Government of India regarding the action taken by the Management of Singareni Collieries is justified in dismissing Salinganti Narasiah Hauler Khalasi from service with effect from 26-10-1983 the same was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 60 of 1985 on 15-10-1985 and notices were issued to both sides. To take steps to file their claims statement as well as counter if any. The matter was adjourned from 13-11-1985 to 27-12-1985 and on that date the management

counsel filed Vakalat for the management and Sri A. K. Jayaprakash Rao also filed Vakalat for the Workman and requested time for filing their claims statement. Time was further extended from 6-2-1986 to 25-2-1986 and the claims statement was filed in the office on 7-3-1986 by the workmen. From that time onwards the Management was given time from 25-3-1986 to 1-5-1986, 14-5-1986, 4-6-1986 and 11-7-1986 and 18-8-1986. The Management took time from 13-11-1985 till 18-8-1986 and filed a counter. It is mentioned part of the said counter that the validity of the domestic enquiry be decided as a preliminary point, and still Sri A. K. Jayaprakash Rao who is the counsel for the workmen mentioned that his party is present and the documents relating to domestic enquiry report also is not filed by the Management and then as the Personnel Officer Sri N. Sriama-murthy, representing Miss G. Sudha stated that the counsel is not ready. Sri A. K. Jayaprakash Rao insisted that costs be awarded as he called the workman to be present for enquiry since they were not filing their counter for the last four or five adjournments. In the said circumstances on 18-8-1986 when there was stiff opposition from the Workers' Counsel for granting adjournments and demanded costs. The Tribunal had occasion to give time for filing enquiry report and to lead evidence on preliminary point and adjourned to 16-9-1986. Since 16-9-1986 is declared as a Holiday the matter was called on 17-9-1986 and there is no representation for the Management and no domestic enquiry report is also filed.

6. The Workman and the Workman Counsel were present and ready. Again the matter was adjourned to 1-10-1986. On that day as the Management and their counsel called absent and there was no representation. Miss Shailaja, Advocate on behalf of the Workman Counsel filed a Memo stating that the Management had taken several adjournments for filing the counter and thereafterwards they did not choose to file the enquiry report even in the Tribunal. It is therefore requested that when several opportunities are given to the Management and when there is no representations from the Management either through their Counsel or authorised representative or anybody on their behalf as the matter involved dismissal of a workman in the year 1983 who is on the verge of starvation and as the matter is protracted by considerable delay, she wanted that the Worker may be permitted to lead evidence, treating the evidence of the management as nil.

7. In the given circumstances having been satisfied from the docket sheet that from 13-11-1985 to 1-10-1986 12 adjournments were given for about 11 months and the Management did not choose to file domestic enquiry report which is the essential documents for verifying or deciding the preliminary point whether the domestic enquiry held proper or not. Though a counter is filed denying that the allegations in the claims statement are not correct. Even after giving sufficient opportunity without any representation whatsoever and even when the Personnel Officer was aware as early as on 18-8-86 on the side for Workmen counsel and Workmen were present and insisted for costs being awarded and when no domestic enquiry report is filed, no documents were filed and thereafterwards two more adjournments were given and on 1-10-86 the workman counsel and the workman insisted that the enquiry be proceeded exparte and as the matter related to workmen who was dismissed in 1983 and the management was not evincing any interest to proceed further. In the said circumstances Memo was allowed as there was no other alternative left.

8. W.W.1 who is the workman concern was examined and he deposed that he worked as Hauler Driver since 10 years and that he is Member of the Workers Union of Singareni Collieries and he was dismissed from service from 26-10-1983. According to him that the management conducted the alleged enquiry against him and the same was not done in accordance with the principles of natural justice. He also denied that the allegations made against him are not true and correct. According to him the contents were not read over and explained to him and the same was recorded in English. He also mentioned that the method and manner of conducting the enquiry was not explained to him. He also mentioned that he was not permitted to take the assistance of a co-employee to defend him in the domestic enquiry. He maintained that

he is an illiterate person knowing only to sign his signature in Telugu and that he did not know to read and write any language. It is also mentioned that the Management did not examine any witnesses in the so-called domestic enquiry though they mentioned that the same workers were present at the time of the incident. According to him in the defence statement he stated that he had no knowledge of alleged beating of Overman and he had nothing to do with the charges. He flatly denied counter averments that the contents of the enquiry proceedings were read over and explained to him. He also mentioned that he is unemployed and he was coming to the Tribunal on all dates of adjournments except on one occasion and the Management did not file enquiry report and did not also adduce any evidence to justify his dismissal and that he worked as Hauler Khalasi-cum-Driver in 6A GDK Incline till the date of his removal and he requested that he should be reinstated with full back wages and other attendant benefits. The dismissal order is given is marked as Ex. W1. It is said that he was guilty of misconduct as per Ex. W1 that he is said to be guilty of misconduct under Clause 16(5) which reads as, drunkenness, fighting, riotous or disorderly or indecent behaviour. The enquiry report is not filed in the Tribunal and it is said that the Additional C.M.E. who is the dismissing authority agreed with the findings of the Enquiry Officer after perusing the same. When the allegations are that he was not given the assistance of a co-worker to defend him and that the proceedings were not conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice and when he denied any knowledge about the alleged beating of Overman and that he had nothing to do with the charges and when the Management did not file enquiry report also in the given circumstances with no record being filed by the Management even after taking eleven months for the best reasons known to themselves when the worker was coming every time except for one occasion and when the Management did not evince any interest in the matter and was dodging the matter for their own reasons best known without even filing the enquiry report and it must be held that the dismissal order given to him which is marked as Ex. W1 is not done in accordance with the principles of natural justice and that the allegation that there was a fair enquiry done and that the charge that he beat the Overman was not also made known to the Tribunal and the same was not shown to be proved and that the same was denied by the workmen in the Tribunal and that it is clearly established on the available evidence that the management having taken five months to file a counter and another six months without filing any domestic enquiry report in the Tribunal, clearly showed that all things are not well with the Management and that there is irresponsibility and also want on delay for the reasons best known to themselves and workman who was dismissed from 26-10-83 was coming to the Tribunal regularly from 27-12-1985 and he cannot be penalised without any findings on a matter that is referred to this Tribunal which is required disposal within a period of three months after the reference under the Act. Having given 11 months and when management is not filing any lot of material required to show that they followed the principles of natural justice while conducting the domestic enquiry and when the statutory requirements is that the matter should be disposed off within three months after its reference and when the Management is given fairly a long adjournments than reasonable time required in the given circumstances. I have no hesitation that the grievance of the workman is justified and his evidence coupled with the order which are not substantiated by the Management cannot be accepted as bona fide proceedings passed after careful perusal of the alleged enquiry report which is not filed in the Tribunal. So I hold that the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited is not justified in dismissing Sri Saricanti Narasiah, Hauler Khalasi from service with effect from 26-10-1983 and the concerned workman is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages and other attendant benefits.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 21st day of October, 1986.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

Annexure of Evidence

Witnesses Examined for the Management:

Witnesses Examined for the workmen:

W.W.1 S. Narasiah

NIL

Documents marked for the Workmen :

Ex. W1 True copy of the dismissal order dt: 25-10-83 issued to S. Narasiah by the Additional C.M.E. R.G. II, S.C. Co. Ltd.,

Documents marked for the Management :

NIL

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Presiding Officer

[No. I-22012/64/84-D. III (B)]

का. घा. 3994.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) का धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रिय सरकार, मै. सिंगरेनी, कालरज कं. लिमिटेड, बेल्लामपल्ली (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) के प्रबंधन में सम्बद्ध नियोक्तों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करता है, जो केन्द्रिय सरकार को 4-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3994—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli (A.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4-11-1986.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL)
AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 31 of 1985

BETWEEN :

The Workmen of Singareni Collieries
Company Limited, Bellampalli,
Adilabad District.

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries,
Company Limited, Bellampalli,
Adilabad District.

APPEARANCES :

Sarv Sri V. Jaganadha Rao, V. Venkata Ramana and
V. Srinivas, Advocate for the workmen.

Sarvasri K. Srinivasa Murthy, H. K. Saigal and Kumari
G. Sudha, Advocates for the Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. I-22012/63/84-D. III (B) dated 17th May, 1985 referred the following dispute under Sections 7A and 10(1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Bellampalli and their Workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Company Limited in termination of the services of Shri Ojethula Odela General Mazdoor, with effect from 1-6-1984, on superannuation, assessing his age to be 60 years is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?"

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 31 of 1985 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The claims statement filed by the Workmen represented by the President of Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, Bellampalli mentioned that there is no age of retirement rules before 1960 and the workmen who completed 60 years as per the so-called service record not being termination in those days. According to him in those days the Clerk who prepared the service record recorded as per his will and pleasure in 1960 the age retirement rules came into force and thereafter wards every individual who was appointed after that date was sent to Medical Board/Medical Officer for physical fitness and age assessment. Whenever the said Medical Board/Medical Officer determine the age it was entered in the service book. In the case of Ojethula Odelu he was appointed on 21-5-1962 and before his appointment he was sent to the Medical Board/Medical Officer for his age assessment and physical fitness. The Medical Officer certified his age as 30 years as on 31-5-1962 likewise in his service card along with other particulars the same age was entered and he was allowed to do his duties but as per the decision of the Medical Board the age of O. Odelu was 30 years as on 31-5-1982. On 1-6-1984 i.e. on the date of termination he is only 51 years but not 60 years. Even in the identity Card which is given in 1967 his age was shown as 30 years as on 31-5-1962. Therefore, terminating his service as alleged on 1-6-1984 is illegal. From 31-5-1962 he had 22 years services but the Management is saying that he had no service record available. In the year 1953 he worked for one month and left the job. For this also there is service record which is available. After a period of 9 years the Management stated that he was reappointed in 1962 and the version of the Management is absolutely untrue. If the re-appointment is true he should continue his service from 1953. Moreover if he is re-appointment in 1962 the so-called service book which was prepared in 1954 showing his service particulars should be filed. So the re-appointment is not true. He was appointed freshly on 31-5-1962. Hence termination of his service under superannuation is illegal and unjust.

3. According to the Management O. Odelu was appointed in the Company in 1953 and if so as the workman was appointed before 1960 the age record was not correct and age retirement rules and the agreement therein dated 22-2-1965 and 17-9-1969 are indicating the same. In his case the three formalities set out in those age retirement rules were not followed. Therefore the so-called age recorded in 1954 on the above post and terminating him on 1-6-1984 is unjustified. The Workers and the Union requested the authority concerned to send him to the Medical Board/Medical Officer for his age assessment but the Management adopted the adamant policy and without sending him to the Medical Board/Medical Officer his service was terminated under superannuation age is illegal and unjust. So on the basis of the record prepared in 1953 his services was terminated as if superannuated. Though the worker gave an application stating that his age is not 60 only 50 by giving an application dated 22-6-83, the authorities did not take any action. The Union also took no action on that. So the retirement of O. Odelu on 1-6-1984 forcibly is unjust and illegal and the same is liable to be set aside.

4. The Management filed a counter stating that in respect of the employees of the Company service book is the basic document containing the date of appointment, age and identification mark etc., In case the date of birth of the employee is recorded in service book as per declaration made by the employee if the necessary documentary proof of the school leaving certificate at the time of appointment. In the case of those who could not produce any documentary proof of age or illiterates, the age as assessed by the Medical Officer is recorded when the party is disputing with the recorded age. In the case of O. Odelu, Mazdoor of the Building Department the service book as shown 30 years as on 12-5-1954 on the date of his first appointment. O. Odelu accepted the age by affixing his finger prints and the service record though he was re-appointed in the Company on 31-5-1962 after a gap of six years which was recorded in the first appointment was taken into account since the service card

was available. It is incorrect to say that he was examined by the Medical Board at the time of re-appointment. Sri S. Nagiah Reddy was one of the signatories for the Settlement arrived at between the parties under Section 12 of the I.D. Act on 26-2-1965, which is marked in Annexure to the claims statement. All these employees who have disputed with regard to the age were referred to the Medical Board when the age of the workman was not disputed then, it was not referred to the Medical Board. In the case of O. Odelu his service card was made up to date only with a remark that he was re-appointed on 31-5-1962. No new procedure was attributed as alleged by the Petitioner. Whatever the age was declared at the time of joining the same was noted down agreeing the same in service record then thumb impression was affixed by the workman concerned. So it is not correct to say that the age was determined by the concerned Clerk as per his will and pleasure. When O. Odelu disputed with regard to his age on the ground that the age mentioned in the identity card and the service card is not tallying and wanted that he should be sent to Medical Board. He was sent to the Medical Board/Age Determination Committee, and on 31-5-1984 the said Medical Board/Age Determination Committee issued a certificate stating that he is above 60 years as on 31-5-1962 and issued a certificate on the workman fixed thumb impression on the said certificate. So the same is final and binding on the employees as per the Company Rules. The Union is estopped to re-agitate the issue again and the decision of the Medical Board/Age Determination Committee is final and binding in all the cases. O. Odelu case as stated earlier the Medical Board/Age Determination Committee clearly indicated that the workman is above 60 years as such the decision is final and binding. So the workman as well as the Union estopped agitating issue again. It is pertinent to submit that inadvertently a clerical error was crept in O. Odelu's identity card; so seeing the identity card of refusal of service record instead of putting 30 years of age as on 12-5-1954 by mistake noted as 30 years age as on 31-5-1962 i.e. from the date of re-appointment. It is a clerical mistake and not based upon any documentary evidence. When the Union selected the disputed case as per the retirement rules framed on 26-2-1965 and 17-9-1969. Those cases were referred to the Medical Board. But they never took up any case with reference to O. Odelu as if there is any dispute. So it is not correct that they did not follow the formality with regard to rules and agreement in the case of O. Odelu. The Management as the Respondent-Company after receipt of representation from the Union of Workmen have referred to the Medical Board and as per the Medical Board he was rightly terminated from service with effect from 31-5-1984 as he completed 60 years.

5. On behalf of the workmen two witnesses were examined as W.W1 and W.W2 and they marked Exs. W1 to W9. On behalf of the Management two documents were marked as Ex. M1 and M2 and the Tribunal marked five left hand thumb impression of Ojethula Odelu as Exs. C1 and C2.

6. According to WW1 he is the President of Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union and O. Odelu joined service as General Mazdoor in the year 21-5-1962 and that at that time the age was shown as 30 years as on 31-5-1962 on the decision of the Medical Board Officers. He was retired on 1-6-1984. Ex. W1 is the copy of the notice of retirement. According to him the service card and identity card of the worker if seen he should have continued with another with another seven years with the said date of retirement. He submitted a representation on 12-2-1984 to the Additional C.M.E. that the workman is entitled to continue in service on the basis of the age recorded in the identity card and the notice of retirement is illegal. Ex. W2 is the copy of the said letter. As the management did not reply he sent another letter on 20-2-1984 to the Conciliation Officer, Mancherla as per Ex. W3. Then the Management replied under Ex. W4 that the workman was referred to the Age Determination Committee as his age is wrongly recorded. Then he addressed another letter to the Conciliation Officer that the age of the worker was recorded as on 31-5-1962 after referred him to the Medical Officer and

the Company should have acted on the said date while retiring the workman. Ex. W5 is the representation and Ex. W6 is the Conciliation Report. He filed the retirement rules framed by the Management as Ex. W7 and the settlement entered into by the Management and the Union as Exs. W8 and W9. He admitted that the workman worked for about 15 days in 1952 and then discontinued and he was appointed again in 1962. According to him when he was appointed for the second time his age was recorded as 30 years as on 31-5-1962 on the ground that the Management lost the said record under which the workman was examined the age was recorded as 30 years, and they tried to retire him on the basis of the assessment of age said to have been made in the year 1952 when the workman served the Company for 15 days. It is the practice in the Company that unless there is dispute raised by the workman himself no case will be referred to the Medical Board for age determination. The company acts only on the basis of the age record in the service card and identity card and therefore the workman is entitled to continue in service on the basis of the entry recorded in the identity record. According to him when the workman was appointed on 12-5-1954 the question of re-appointment on 31-5-1962 will not arise. He denied the suggestion that he worked upto 1957 and left the Company for six years and when he prayed for mercy he was reappointed on 31-5-1962. Witness added that the Management was dismissing the workers for absence of 4 to 9 days as they see in the daily routine and he was of opinion that the management would not have appointed him after six years lapse on that ground. It is his case that when they entered into the Settlement Exs. W8 and W9 the case of O. Odolu seeking for reference either by himself or by the Union did not arise. According to him as per Ex. W8 settlement it will not apply to those persons who were in the service after 1960 and it applies to those who were earlier to 1960 and as per Ex. W9 settlement the position was clarified stating that it also applies to the employee who joined before 1960. According to him if the service book is maintained for O. Odolu then Exs. W7 to W9 will come into play and if there is no service book maintained for him then he had a case. After seeing Ex. M2 he explained that it is not the certificate of the Medical Board but it is certificate given by the Age Determination Committee. According to him for age determination committee the matters are referred with reference to variations in age. It is his case that there is no variation of age in the case of O. Odolu as entered in the service book and other records maintained by the Management. Moreover he pointed out that he was sent to the Age Assessment Board one day before his retirement under Ex. M2. He also mentioned that he questioned the preretirement notice and the Medical Board also had no right to examine him. He denied the suggestion that O. Odolu was rightly terminated after completion of 60 years of age that there is no illegality done by the Management.

7. Ojjethula Odely was also examined as W.W2 who is the affected workman. According to him in the year 1962 he joined service in the company and the Company Doctor noted as 30 years by examining him, and he was unnecessarily removed from service stating that he retired due to superannuation. He mentioned that he joined in the Company in 1954 and worked for one or two months for temporary periods and denied the suggestion that the Company took thumb impression and verifying the date of birth and maintained the service register at that time. Actually the identification marks noted on him are quite different from the identification marks noted in the so-called service register. He denied the thumb impression on Ex. M1. At the request of the Counsel for the Management two batches of thumb impressions of O. Odolu left hand five fingers were taken in the open Court as requested and they are marked as Exs. C1 and C2. According to him it was not true that he was got examined by the Doctor and his age determined by the Doctor entered in any service book in 1954 itself and they took thumb impression on the paper shown to him Ex. M2 and they told him that he was 60 years already as he was appointed when he was 30 years. In 1962 he denied that he was 30 years old in 1954. There is no evidence for the management.

8. The case was actually referred to this Tribunal on 22-5-1985 and numbered as I.D. No. 31 of 1985 and notices were given to both the parties when the matter was referred by the Government of India and both of them came and appeared to the Tribunal on 21-6-1985. Though the Management filed vakalat they took time for counter till 19-7-1985 and they filed the counter on 19-7-1985. The workmen Counsel Sri Venkatramana examined on 18-2-1986 their witnesses as W.W1 and W.W2 in chief. The Management took adjournment to cross examine them on 18-2-1986 and also on 16-4-1986 and as the Management did not cross examine them the evidence of W.W1 and W.W2 was treated as closed. Thereafterwards the Management filed petition M. P. No. 132/86 to reopen the matter for cross-examining W.W1 and W.W2. W.W1 and W.W2 were cross examined on 25-8-1986 and the management marked Exs. M1 and M2. Ex. M1 is marked subject to proof. Exs. C1 and C2 are marked in the Court. Miss G. Sudha counsel for the Management promised to take steps for sending the disputed document Ex. M1 and C1 and C2 to Finger Print Expert and the matter was called on 26-8-1986. The Workmen reported that they closed their evidence and the Management Counsel did not take any steps with regard to the disputed documents Ex. M1 and C1 and C2 for sending them to the Finger Print Expert. For the Management evidence, it is posted to 17-9-1986 and on 17-9-1986 the Management was called absent, no representation was made. The Workers President was present and he pointed out that no steps were taken by the Management even after one month to send the documents to the Finger Print Expert. On 1-10-1986 there is no representation for the Management either by their counsel or by authorised representative. The workman filed a Memo opposing further adjournments and wanted that the tribunal to hear their arguments and the workers arguments were heard as addressed by Sri. V. Srinivasa. Then one more opportunity for arguments of the management is given by posting it to 4-10-1986. As there is no representation or request for any adjournment for the management, the matter was closed on 4-10-1986.

9. The admitted facts are that Management filed two documents Exs. M1 and M2. Ex. M1 is a disputed document. According to the Management this Ojjethula Odolu was appointed on 12-5-1954 for the first time and he worked till 14-6-1954 and he was reappointed on 31-5-1962 and the service card which was said to have been opened on 12-5-1954 was continued after he was reappointed on 31-5-1962 and by mistake when he was appointed on 31-5-1962 the age was shown as 30 years and thus clerical mistake crept in O. Odolu's identity card. First of all careful perusal of page 1 which is a torn slip in Ex. M1 which is dispute by the workman as well as mentioned by W.W1 would show that it had no comparison with the other sheets of so-called identity record Ex. M1. Ex. M1 first stage starts with page 2 and pages 2 and 3 which is the first page is shown to be pasted to the cover page as indicated in Ex. M1 and the colour and age of the said torn page definitely varies from the colour and age of the other pages of the remaining identity pass book. The Management case is that as he was appointed prior to 1960 some time on 12-5-1954 when his age was shown as 30 years and when he was re-appointed on 31-5-1962 after the commencement of the retirement rules and age determination committee as per Exs. W7 to W9. The Management having found that there is a discrepancy and sent him to Age Determination Committee on 31-5-1984 and found that he completed 30 years by 31-5-1984 and he was terminated from 1-6-1984 on the basis of the Age Determination Committee Report. The workers case is that when he entered service for one or two months in 1954 no particulars were taken and he never stated to anybody that his age is 30 years as on 12-5-1954 and that it is all concocted story and actually when he joined the Company on 31-5-1962 he was examined by the Medical Board and his age was entered as 30 years as on 31-5-1962 and therefore he is entitled to continue till 60 years are completed i.e. till 31-5-1992. Now there is no dispute about the rules and the commencement of the rules or the operation of the rules and agreements under Exs. W7 to W9. It is not the case of the Management that O. Odolu case was referred by the Workers Union at any

time to decide his age. It is case of the Management that till 31-5-1982 they never referred him to the Medical Board/Age Determination Committee. On one hand the worker took up the stand he was referred to the Medical Board when he entered service on 31-5-1962 and it was determined as he was aged as 30 years on that date and therefore the question of further referring him to the Medical Board did not arise. This is denied by the Management. But they did not file any documents, under the rules to show that they have got any record except Ex. M1. Ex. M1 is denied and opposed by the workmen. It is not proved. As deposed by W.W1 as per Ex. W8 Settlement all the workmen services record could have been verified with reference to the Company Medical Officer known at the earlier point of time. But it was not done so. Infact the case of the workman is that he was appointed on 31-5-1962 and therefore at that time itself medical rules were in force as per Ex. W7 and he was examined. Even under Ex. W9 settlement it is mentioned that it applies to the service of the employees who joined before 1960. Ex. W9 is dated 17-9-1969. Therefore regarding O. Odelu on 31-5-1962 one day before the retirement date, sending him to the Age Determination Committee cannot be said to be a correct process. On the other hand the workmen was agitating through the Trade Union as per Ex. W2 to W6 regarding the retirement done abruptly. It is surprising that the Management made service record when the workman worked for one month is on the very day is on 12-5-1954 when he entered service. It was never the practice; Whereas to everybody's knowledge that there are no service rules as per Ex. W7 to W9 and the workmen were agitating for fixation of proper age by Medical Board or Age Determination Committee as the case may be and only disputed cases were being referred. So it is not a case where workmen wanted the age should be determined the same were being referred. He was admittedly continuously appointed from 31-5-1962 as General Mazdoor and he should have been referred when he is an illiterate person to determine his age as per Exs. W7 to W9 at the earliest point of time. It is not done so. They rely upon thumb impression on Ex. M1 first sheet, which are disputed by the Workmen i.e. W.W2 and the same was not sent to thumb impression expert to be compared with admitted thumb impression which were taken in the Tribunal as per Exs. C1 and C2. They were expected to be sent to the Finger Print Expert along with Ex. M1. They were not sent even after sufficient time was given and no steps were taken by the Management to send them to the Finger Print Expert. Further the marks of identification noted at page 3 of Ex. M1 did not tally with the marks of identification actually found on W.W2 when he was in the witness box. Further it is strange that while there are machine punching holes in Ex. M1 book at two places on all pages even including the cover page, there are no such machine punching holes on the alleged "first sheet" which is said to be part of the service card maintained for Ojjothulu Odelu. This is already observed to be pasted to cover and its age and colour differs from other pages also. When there is no method of maintaining of service card and there were no rules prior to 1960 and those people who are being entered into service before 1960, the workers were taking up age determination through Medical Board by way of Settlement and agreements. It is surprising that Ex. M1 first page was prepared then and there on 12-5-1954 and marks of identification did not tally with the marks of identification of the witness concerned who was present in the Tribunal and as mentioned it is also not punched in the first page of Ex. M1 and Ex. M1 is rightly disputed as a document regarding its genuineness and the thumb impression on Ex. M1 should have been compared with the admitted thumb impressions of Ex. C1 and C2 taken in the Tribunal. No steps were taken and no managements witness was examined to corroborate Ex. M1 and it is a document marked subject to proof and identification and thus looked from any angle on the basis of evidence of W.W1 and W.W2 as well as representation under Exs. W2 to W6 as well as the Settlement and agreements under Ex. W7 to W9, the order of age determination passed on the last day under Ex. M2 is a belated stand and it cannot be said that it is only a clerical mistake that by mistake that they carried the averment that he was aged 30 years on 12-5-1954 as 30 years even when he was reappointed on 31-5-1962 and that they came to know about it for the first time on 31-5-1984. Thus even

while interpreting settlements and agreements under Ex. W7 to W9 when Ex. M1 first page did not tally with any of the particulars of W.W2 and when the same is not proved and when Ex. C1 and C2 documents are not sent to the Final Print Expert to be compared with the disputed thumb impressions under Ex. M1 also it must be held that the oral evidence as well as documentary evidence where identifications marks also do not tally has a great bearing and that he entered service on 31-5-1962 and that he was examined by the Medical Board as per the existing rules which came into force by then and he was found to be 30 years as on 31-5-1962 is correct and the termination order passed under Ex. W1 with effect from 1-6-1984 on the alleged ground that he completed superannuation is unjustified. In the said circumstances he is entitled to be in service till 31-5-1992 as per the admission of the Management that he was 30 years as on 31-5-1962 when he entered into service and that he is entitled for reinstatement in the said circumstances and also back wages and all other attendant benefits.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal this the 9th day of October, 1986.

J. VENGOPALA RAO, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined

for the Workmen :

W.W1 S. Nagaiah Reddy,

W.W2 O. Odelu.

Witnesses Examined

for the Management.

—NIL—

Documents marked for the Workmen :

- Ex. W1 True copy of the letter dt. 29-6-83 addressed by Senior Executive Engineer, Bellampalli to Ojjothulu Odelu, with regard to notice of termination of Employment due to Superannuation.
- Ex. W2 True copy of the letter dt. 12-2-84 addressed by S. Nagaiah Reddy, President Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, to the Additional Chief Mining Engineer, S.C. Co. Ltd., Bellampalli Division-2 with regard to illegal and forcible termination notice to O. Odelu.
- Ex. W3 True copy of the letter dt. 20-2-84 addressed by S. Nagaiah Reddy, President, Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union to the Asst. Labour Commissioner (C) Mancherial with regard to illegal and forcible termination notice to O. Odelu.
- Ex. W4 True Copy of the letter dt. 29/30-7-84 addressed by Additional C.M.E. BD-II S.C. Co. Ltd., to the Asst. Labour Commissioner (C) Mancherial with regard to alleged, and forcible termination notice to O. Odelu.
- Ex. W5 True copy of the letter dt. 9-8-84 addressed by S. Nagaiah Reddy, President Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union to the Asst. Labour Commissioner (C) Mancherial with regard to illegal and forcible termination of O. Odelu.
- Ex. W6 True copy of the Minutes of discussions held in the Office of the Additional Chief Mining Engineer, Bellampalli Division-II on 25-10-84. On 25-10-84 in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of S. C. Co. Ltd., and their workman represented by T.C.M.L. Union regarding alleged and forcible termination of Sri Ojjothulu Odelu General Mazdoor Building Department, Bellampalli.
- Ex. W7 True copy of the Age retirement rules of S.C. Co., Ltd.,

Ex. W8 True copy of the Memorandum of Settlement arrived at during the Conciliation Proceedings held by the Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Hyderabad under Section 12 of the I.D. Act, 1947 on 26-2-1965 in the dispute between the workers of S.C. Co. Ltd., Bellampalli represented by the Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union and the Management of S.C. Co. Ltd.,

Ex. W9 True copy of the Memorandum of Settlement dt. 17-9-1969 arrived at in the Conciliation Proceedings of the Conciliation Proceedings held by the Chief Labour Commissioner (C) New Delhi under Section 12 of the I.D. Act, 1947 in the Dispute between the Management of S.C. Co. Ltd., and their workmen represented by the Singareni Collieries Workers Union, Kothagudem and Tandur Coal Mines Union, Bellampalli.

Documents marked for the Management

Ex. M1 Identity & Service Card pertains to Ojiothula Odalu.

Ex. M2 Age Determination Committee consisting of General Manager, Bpa. Superintendent of Area Hospital, BPA. and Sr. P. O. BD. II.

Documents marked by the Court.

Ex. C1 5 Left Hand Thumb impression of O. Odalu.

Ex. C2. -Do-

J. VENGOPALA RAO, Presiding Officer

[No. I-22012/63/84-D. III(B)]

का. आ. 3995.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) का धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्राय सरकार, में, सिंगरेनी कोलरज कंपनी लिमिटेड, रामाकृष्णपुर डिविजन, जिला आदिलाबाद (आन्ध्र प्रदेश), के प्रबन्ध तंत्र में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट का प्रकाशित करता है, जो केन्द्राय सरकार का 4-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3995.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited Ramkrishnapur Division, Distt. Adilabad (A.P.) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 50 of 1984

BETWEEN

The Workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division-I,
P.O. Ramakrishnapur.

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited Ramakrishnapur Division-I,
P.O. Ramakrishnapur.

APPEARANCES :

Sri G. Bikshapathy, Advocate for the Workmen.

Sarvasri K. Srinivasa Murthy, H. K. Saigal and Kumari G. Sudha, Advocate for the management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Rehabilitation; by its Order No. L-22012(12)/84-D.III(B) dated 23-7-1984 referred the following dispute under Sections 7A and 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, between the employers in relation to the Management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Company Limited, and their workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"Whether the action of the Management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division-I, P.O. Ramakrishnapur, Dist. Adilabad (A.P.) in not confirming Shri M. Satyanarayana, Conveyor Khalasi, in the post of Clerk Grade-II and also not paying him officiating allowance for the period from 4-12-82 to 30-5-83 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 50 of 1984 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. In the claims statement it is mentioned that Sri M. Satyanarayana, Conveyor Khalasi and he is the member of the Singareni Collieries Clerical Association and the case of the workmen is espoused by the Union. According to the Association the said workman is a Graduate having passed B.A. in 1973 and he was appointed as General Mazdoor with effect from 4-8-1974 since he was a Graduate the Petitioner was directed to officiate as Clerk ever since he was appointed he worked as Coal Screening Plant at KK-I as Clerk at the Weigh bridge from 1974 to August 1977. Thereafterwards he was transferred to C.S.P. Ramakrishnapur in September, 1977. Even at Ramakrishnapur also the workman was discharging the duties of Clerk. The workman was promoted as conveyor khalasi with effect from 1-11-1979. Notwithstanding his promotion in the lower categories the workman continued to work as Clerk in view of his educational qualifications. Though the Management has been extracting the duties of clerk from the workman the difference of wages were not paid for the reasons best known to them. The workman is entitled for the post of clerk in pursuant of the Settlement under Section 12(3) of the I.D. Act, on 29-1-1981. While so the Senior Personnel Officer, Sri Narsimha Reddy undertook indefinite fast in the month of May 1983 protesting against the ill-treatment meted out to him by some officers and all the workmen of Ramakrishnapur-I Division went on strike in sympathy with him. At that time the workman herein is General Secretary of the Telugunadu Trade Union council. He actively participated in solving this issue. Therefore the Executive Engineer, C.S.P., R.K.P. issued letter dated 14-5-83 reverting the workman as conveyor khalasi on the instruction of Additional C.E. till the issue of such letter the workman was discharging his duties as officiating clerk ever since from 1974 without any remarks whatsoever. The reversion of the workman is a clear case of victimisation. Instead of the management absorbing the workman as Clerk Grade II, they have chosen to revert him as conveyor khalasi without any valid and proper reason. Further it is also pointed out that Sasankara Rao and R. Ella Reddy who are working as Lower category were promoted in Grade II in terms of the settlement dated 29-1-1981 and they were given authorisation for officiating Grade II Clerk from 4-10-1982 onwards. Thus the workman is entitled for absorption as Grade II Clerk as mentioned in the claims statement.

3. The Management filed a counter stating that Sri M. Satyanarayana was working as Conveyor Khalasi in C.S.P. Ramakrishnapur and he was authorised to work as Clerk from 4-10-1982 to 3-12-1982 and was paid officiating allowance. It is also mentioned that Sri M. Satyanarayana continued to officiate upto 13-5-1983 and he was advised

6. Admittedly as per the Management own counter Sri M. Satyanarayana who is working as Conveyor Khalasi was authorised to work as Clerk for two months from 4-10-1982 to 3-12-1982 and again from 4-12-1982 to 13-5-1983. It is also admitted that the officiating allowance from 4-12-1982 to 13-5-1983 was paid as per the orders of this Tribunal on 3-1-1985. Ex W-1 would show that he is a Member of Singareni Collieries Clerical Association and Ex. W2 is authorisation given by him to raise the dispute to the Management Ex. W-3 would show that he is a Graduate, he was appointed as General Mazdoor in Colliery in 1974. He was Graduate by 1973 itself and he was appointed as General Mazdoor in Collieries in 1974. Though he was recruited as mazdoor as per the case of the Union. Now according to WW-1 though they were extracting duties of clerk from Sri M. Satyanarayana he was not paid officiating allowance for Grade II Cadre and finally he was given written authorisation to officiate as Grade II Clerk from 4-10-1982 to 3-12-1982 for that period he was paid officiating allowance, and thereafterwards he continued without any written authorisation till 13-5-1983. According to him the Personnel Officer, RKP I Division resorted to fast unto death for the ill-treatment meted out to him and this M Satyanarayana who started Telugunadu Trade Union Council as General Secretary of the Union supported the fast taken up by Sri C. Narasimha Reddy and Ex. W-6 is the pamphlet supporting the fast and WW-1 also mentioned that on 11-5-1983 they started fast unto death and they also conducted relay hunger strike in sympathy with him and from 13-5-1983 they reverted Sri M. Satyanarayana as conveyor khalasi from 14-5-1983 and the settlement was arrived at on the very next day after the settlement of the fast undertaken by C. Narasimha Reddy and this settlement was done on 13-5-1983 when the Superior Officers expressed for this incident that there will be no victimisation in any manner against the workmen. He also mentioned that there was Settlement entered by them with the Management with reference to recruitment of clerks. According to the second settlement the Graduate in service who are working for more than six years in service shall be appointed as Clerk and the relevant item of the Settlement has been reproduced in the claims settlement itself and Ex. W-7 is the letters written by the Union for implementing Settlement and in respect of Sri M. Satyanarayana by fixing him as Grade II Clerk and Ex W-8 is the postal acknowledgement and Ex W-9 is protest letter sent by them. Ex W-10 is a representation made by them to the Assistant Labour Commissioner and Ex. W-11 is the representation made by their President to the Executive Director with regard to the implementation of the Memorandum of Settlement dated 29-1-1981. Ex W12 is the minutes of conciliation proceedings held before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Central Hyderabad and Ex W-13 is the views of the Union before the Conciliation Officer and Ex W-14 is the failure conciliation report. According to them though Sasanka Reddy, General Mazdoors Mandamarri and Ella Reddy were promotees as Clerks in pursuant of the Settlement without any written test and interview, because they were Graduates

covered by the Settlement, the same consideration was not shown in the case of Sri M. Satyanarayana. In the cross examination it is mentioned that there is a Craft Union. He denied the suggestion that M. Satyanarayana was given third chance to appear for the test and he failed. According to him the matter was under dispute and was referred to the Tribunal and he admitted that those departmental candidates who were confirmed without qualifying test were shown in Ex. M-1 and he mentioned that it applies to the employees who worked prior to 29-1-1981 of course the witness mentioned that the same applied to M. Satyanarayana also, as he is working prior to 29-1-1981. He explained that he could not file any office order to show that Sri M. Satyanarayana was working as Clerk prior to 1982 and he was not given any office order but he mentioned that their Union represented in 1981 itself to that fact. The Settlement entered by the Management with the Union is marked as Ex. M1. He denied that Ex. M1 is not applicable to him. He also denied that as per the records only Ella Reddy and Sasankar Rao are eligible for regularisation and not Sri M. Satyanarayana. He also denied that there was no victimisation, the claim of Satyanarayana was by passed.

7. W.W. 2 is the workman himself. He denied the suggestion that one should secure 40 per cent of the marks for eligibility to sit for a qualifying test for clerks for internal candidates. According to him the Management has taken candidates who have passed compartmentally securing 35 marks also. He agreed that under Ex. M2 and M3 the Circulars prescribed 40 per cent of marks for qualifying for all Divisions. It is his case that he was not intimated that he failed. According to him Ex. W4 is a circular calling for interview and Ex. M5 circular intimating that he had not passed the test held in January 1982 at Bellampally for the post of Clerk Grade II. He denied the suggestion that he was intimated for the second time also in similar manner. He also denied that there were clerical cadre in the Company for which recruitments were being done when I joined as General Mazdoor and he joined on his own accord for the sake of job. He denied that he did not work as a clerk prior to 29th January, 1981. He worked as Clerk from 1974. According to him the Clerical Association asked for regularisation of his post regularising him as Clerk for the period of fixation also. According to him Ex. M6 shows that he was officiating allowance as Grade II Clerk for the period from 4th December, 1982 to 13th May, 1983 that communication was not given to him (actually the said amount is paid as per the Orders of the Tribunal on 3rd January, 1985 after the counter is filed).

8. W.W. 3 is D. Malla Reddy. The Byelaws of the Association are marked as Ex. W15 and he mentioned that M. Satyanarayana who is the Clerk involved in this reference worked with him in 1974 at K.K.I.C.S.P. Mandamarri and that they were extracting the work of clerk whenever there was shortage from Weigh Bridge and to C.S.P. and M. Satyanarayana worked till as Clerk in Weigh Bridge during that period in 1974. According to him M. Satyanarayana continued to work as on Weigh Bridge and he was transferred from K.K.I., CSP II to R. K. P. CSP in 1977. From 1977 till the date of termination 1983 he worked at RKP CSP as Clerk only and they extracted the duties of clerk for all these years. He asserted that the Wagon Weigh Register would show whether Satyanarayana officiated as Clerk at K.K.I CSP in 1974 and 1975 or not. He also further stated that when he worked as loading and checking clerk at K.K.I. CSP there are other workmen who were working on shifts and M. Satyanarayana was working as Weigh Bridge Clerk and he asserted that the said records of Weigh bridge will show that M. Satyanarayana worked as Clerk. According to him M. Satyanarayana worked as clerk. According to him M. Satyanarayana appeared for Clerical test on two occasions but he did not apply for July 1984 test and he denied that he failed to appear for the third occasion also. He denied that there is 30 per cent absenteeism in the Clerical side. He denied the suggestion that their Union is not competent to raise the issue. According to him under Bye-law 22 of Ex. W15 they can raise the dispute with reference to 35 clerks of Godavari Khani and this is a case and that he also added that writ petition is filed by the management against the award of this Tribunal in Godavari Khani where they succeeded also and quoted as I.D. No. 11/82.

9. The admitted facts are that Sri M. Satyanarayana Conveyor Khalasi was recruited in the Department as Khalasi since 1974. Ex. W3 is the provisional certificate issued by the Osmania University would show that he was a Graduate even at the time he was recruited as General Mazdoor. He was promoted as Conveyor Khalasi from 1st November, 1979 and it is his case that from that date till 14th May, 1983 he worked as Clerk. The Management case is as per the counter that he worked as Clerk for two months from 4th October, 1982 to 3rd December, 1982 and again from 4th December, 1982 to 13th May, 1983 ultimately the Management conceded that they did not pay officiating allowance for the period from 4th December, 1982 to 13th May, 1983 and the same was ordered to be paid after industrial dispute is numbered and after counter is filed by the Management. So the non-payment of officiating allowance for the period worked is not a matter in issue now. But the Clerks evidence supported by his colleague W.W. 3 would show that the workman M. Satyanarayana worked as Weigh Bridge Clerk even prior to 29th January, 1981 Ex. M1 Settlement came into force and in this regard it is asserted by the workmen as well as W.W. 3 that the Wagon Weigh Bridge Register will show that in 1974 when W.W. 3 and W.W. 2 were at K.K.I. CSP Satyanarayana was officiating as Clerk at K.K.I. CSP and the documents were with the Management. In fact W.W. 3 had gone to the extent of stating that he was working as Loading Checker and as loading checker he used to receive wagons and get them loaded with variety of coal and at the Weigh Bridge there will be one Foreman, one loading checker and one Weigh Bridge Clerk. According to him if the Foreman is not available readily loading checker will officiate as Foreman and then the Weigh Bridge Clerk will work as Loading Checker and if the Weigh Bridge Clerk is not available then the next shift Weigh Bridge Clerk will be given over time and he will be in charge of Weigh Bridge Clerk duties. In fact he mentioned at that time one Nair, Vardaraj and Rajeshwar Rao worked as three Weigh Bridge Clerks during their shifts and at that time M. Satyanarayana was working as Weigh Bridge Clerk. The Management put a question to W.W.3 to produce the records to show that Satyanarayana worked as Weigh Bridge Clerk. The answer given by him would show that the Weigh Bridge record will be with the Management and they should have been produced by the Management to deny the same. In fact W.W. 3 was cross examined at length by the Management. They could have taken time to produce the Weigh Bridge records and show the relevant period and deny that there was no such entries made by M. Satyanarayana as Weigh Bridge Clerk. The concerned person who worked as Loading Checker asserted that M. Satyanarayana worked along with him as Weigh Bridge Clerk and that the records of Weigh Bridge Register would show the same by not filing the said records. The management wonce the Clerk who officiated to produce the records. There cannot be any other records except the records maintained by the Management in such circumstances. So the evidence of W.W. 2 and W.W. 3 would justify that the workers cannot file any documents to show that from 1974 to 1978 that M. Satyanarayana worked as officiating on Weigh Bridge as the records are available with C.S.P.K.K.I as asserted by W.W. 3. It is admitted ever by the Management that under Exs. M4 and M5 circulars it was shown that on one occasion M. Satyanarayana who was sent for appearing for test failed, if such a records are maintained the Management should have come forward to show that he failed for the second time and third time also. But the workmen himself admitted that he did not pass the test for the second time but denied that he was given third opportunity. In fact the case was that by the time third opportunity came to him this dispute is referred due to the failure report under Ex. W14 and he also relied upon Ex. W11 representation made by Malla Reddy who was also examined as W.W. 3 with regard to implementation of Memorandum of Settlement dated 29th January, 1981. Now that he was demanding for implementation of the Settlement could be seen from the Workers Union representative letter Ex. W7 dated 11th April, 1981 and the postal acknowledgement Ex. W8. So it cannot be said that there is no representation at all under Ex. W9 and W10 which are protest letter on reversion of M. Satyanarayana as well as representation to the Assistant Commissioner of Labour which subsequent matters. So Ex. W7 would show that the dispute is raised by the Union and the Union was authorised under Ex. W2 dated 14th May, 1984 authorisation given to the Union to deal with his case.

10. Apart from all this it is agreed as matter of fact that the Management entered into a settlement with four Major Unions and Exs. M1 is the said settlement. W.W. 3 explained that in 1974 he was union activist but in a different union and he also mentioned that M. Satyanarayana was working as Clerk Grade II in 1974, 1975 and 1976 or 1977 and thus there was no occasion for them to raise such a dispute. It is his (W.W. 3) case that they represented for the first time in 1979 that regarding M. Satyanarayana that he was not properly given continuation as Clerk Grade II. Now when the workers asserted that there are documents especially weigh bridge register and that they had occasion to see M. Satyanarayana work as officiating clerk from 1974 to 1978 at the weigh bridge when the Management did not produce the said records which are with them and which were not even denied to be destroyed; or not to have been in their possession. It is manifestly clear that the assertion of the workmen must be believed in the given circumstances as the weigh bridge record is a permanent register to be maintained by the Management regarding loading and unloading of coal with regard to weight of coal lifted into the vehicle etc. and who was entering these entries is a matter of record. Now even number Ex. M1 Clause 11 would show as follows:

"Recruitment.—Graduates in service on other jobs other than those taken on for special training purposes will be given preference on the basis of test reserving 25 per cent of the posts exclusively for such internal candidates. For this purpose internal candidates coming on their own merit will be excluded."

So the Union will furnish specific cases of all other categories of workers acting as Clerks, the candidates have the requisite qualifications and continuously worked will be confirmed in their posts as if to satisfy report about their work and conduct. Others who are continuously acting but not qualified will be considered for other suitable jobs. The first part refers to graduates in service of other jobs other than those taken on for special training purposes and they will be given preference on the basis of test reserving 25 per cent of the posts exclusively for such internal candidates. For this purpose internal candidates coming on their merits will be excluded. Evidently under Clause 11 first part the present workmen Sri M. Satyanarayana being Graduate is not coming for being recruited under the second part of Clause 11 if the Union takes up specific cases and if the candidates had requisite qualifications and continuously working over six months he will be confirmed in their post subject to satisfactory report and work and their conduct.

11. Now under this second part when M. Satyanarayana is working even earlier to the Settlement Ex. M1 which is dated 29-1-1981 the principle that were applicable to Malla Reddy and Sasankar Rao would automatically come into play to the case of M. Satyanarayana also. Exs. M2 and M3 circulars no doubt prescribed certain percentage of mark say 40 per cent for eligibility to suit for qualifying test for clerks for internal candidates but the Management those candidates who were comparatively should secure 35 marks also were taken into service. Now if he was intimated that he was failed candidates as shown under Ex. M5 there must be similar intimations that he sat for two more times and failed in the test held subsequent interviews held by the Management. Except Ex. M5 there is no other documents to show that the management had conducted written test showing him as a failed candidate. But on the other hand the workers himself conceded that he sat for the second time also and denied that he was given third chance for appearing qualifying test and that he did not sit for it. Now simply because he did not ask the officiating allowance for the period he worked during 1974 and 1977 it cannot be said that he did not work as officiating clerk unless the weigh bridge register is shown for the relevant period of K.K.L., C.S.P. where he worked indicating that he was not there. The management is in custody of the said register and failed to produce it.

12. Now it is the Management case that he was given officiating allowance from 4-10-1982 to 13-5-1983 at any rate he officiated more than six months continuously under Clause 11 of Ex. M1 when candidates having requisite qualifications and continuously worked over six months when

the Workers Union furnished the specific cases of those workers acting as Clerks the Management has to confirm them in their posts subject to satisfactory reports. It is not their case that between 4-10-1982 to 13-5-1983 when he worked for more than six months the workmen have any unsatisfactory reports about his work and conduct. Further when his case is taken up by the Union and when he worked for continuously for over six months and when he is paid officiating allowance he comes under second part of recruitment for confirmation irrespective of the fact that he was continuously working from 1974 till 1979. So the very fact that Ex. M6 is filed and very fact that they conceded in their counter that they offered officiating allowance between 4-10-1982 to 13-5-1983 would show that he comes under the second category of workers and it cannot be said that Malla Reddy, Sasankar Rao are general mazdoor who were working for the earlier period of 29-1-1981 and whereas this M. Satyanarayana worked only from 4-10-1982 to 13-5-1983 which is a later period and therefore it had no application. In fact the settlement which comes into force on 29-1-1981 not only covers the clerks who were working earlier and also those people who are working with requisite qualifications continuously for over six months subsequently also. There is no provision under Ex. M1 specifically that it will not apply to the workers after 29-1-1981. So no such interpretation can be given against interests of workmen from a perusal of Ex. M1 settlement. There is though the Management said that Malla Reddy and Sasankar Rao were given facilities for different reasons they could not produce any records to distinguish them from the case of M. Satyanarayana so as to interpret Ex. M1 will not apply to M. Satyanarayana. Moreover Ex. W15 Clause 22 would show that the association can represent grievances in any category of workmen employed in S. C. Company Limited and thus it is high time that the management contention that the Association had no authority to represent the workmen should be held as baseless and untenable.

13. Thus on a careful consideration I hold that the action of the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Company Limited Ramakrishnapur Division-I, P.O. Ramakrishnapur District Adilabad (A.P.) is not justified in not confirming Sri M. Satyanarayana, Convevor Khalrai, in the post of Clerk Grade II and also not paying him officiating allowance for the period from 4-12-1982 to 30-5-1983 till after the counter is filed. But it must be held that the non-payment of allowance on the ground of refusal by the workman and the subsequent admission of the workman that he revised the said amounts before he gave evidence would answer that part of the demand as closed. Now the workman is therefore entitled to be confirmed as Grade II Clerk from the commencement of the Settlement Ex. M-1 i.e. 29-1-1981 with attendant benefits and back wages in the post of Grade II Clerk with further promotion if any, subsequently.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 13th day of October, 1986.

Sd./
Industrial Tribunal

Appendix of Evidence

Witness Examined
for the Management:
NIL

Witness Examined
for the Workmen:
W.W.1 V.S.V.S.R.K.S. Prasad
W.W.2 M. Satyanarayana
W.W.3 D. Malla Reddy.

Documents marked for the Workmen:

Ex. W1 Admission/Bio-data form of M. Satyanarayana.
Ex. W2 Authorisation letter of M. Satyanarayana.

- Ex. W3 Photostat copy of the Provisional Certificate of M. Satyanarayana issued by Osmania University.
- Ex. W4 Photostat copy of the letter dated 14-5-1983 addressed by Executive Engineer, CSP-RKP to M. Satyanarayana advising him to work as original post of conveyor khalasi from 14-5-83 instead of Officiating clerk in Coal Depot.
- Ex. W5 Photostat copy of the Office Order dt. 18-10-82 issued to M. Satyanarayana by the Additional C.M.E. RKP. I, S.C. Co. Ltd.
- Ex. W6 Strike call given by T.N.I.U.C. Ramakrishnapur.
- Ex. W7 Letter dt. 11-4-81 addressed by D. Malla Reddy, President, SICCA, to the Asstt. Engineer, Coal Screening Plant, the S.C. Co. Ltd., RKP with regard to confirmation of M. Satyanarayana as Clerk Grade II.
- Ex. W8 Under Certificate of Posting slip dt. 13-4-81 addressed to the Asstt. Engineer, the S.C. Co. Ltd., Coal Screening Plant, RKP Division, Ramakrishnapuram-504301.
- Ex. W9 Representation dt. 16-5-83 made by V.S.V.S. R.K.S. Prasad, Secretary-I Division, RKP Branch to the Additional Chief Engineer, Ramakrishnapur Division.
- Ex. W10 Representation dt. 25-5-1983 made by V.S.S.V. R.K.S. Prasad, Secretary I Division, SICCA, RKP to the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), Man- cherial.
- Ex. W11 Representation dt. 28-9-83 made by D. Malla Reddy, President SICCA Central Council to the Executive Director the S.C. Co. Ltd., Bellampalli.
- Ex. W12 Minutes of conciliation proceedings held on 17-12-83 before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Hyderabad (Camp Mancheri- al).
- Ex. W13 Views of the Union.
- Ex. W14 Failure of conciliation report dt. 19-1-84.
- Ex. W15 True copy of the Bye laws of the Association.
- Documents marked for the Management:
- Ex. M1 True copy of the Memorandum of Settlement dt. 29-1-81 under Section 12(3) of the I.D. Act, 1947 between the Management of S.C. Co. Ltd., and their workmen represented by (1) S.C. Work- ers, Union (2) Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union. (3) S.C. Employees Union and (4) A. P. Colliery Mazdoor Sangh.
- Ex. M2 Letter dt. 21/24-12-83 addressed by executive Director, Bellampalli to All Pits and Departments of BPA, MM. RKP and SKP Divisions and C.C.C. with regard to recruitment of Clerks Grade-II.
- Ex. M3 Notice dt. 26-7-84 issued by Executive Director, Bellampalli to all Pits and Departments of BPA, MM. and SRP Division with regard to Recruitment of Clerks Grade II.
- Ex. M4 Letter dt. 18-1-82 addressed to M. Satya- narayana and 28 others by the General Manager, Bellampalli, S.C. Co. Ltd. with regard to Selection for a post of Clerk Grade II.
- Ex. M5 Letter 8/11-3-82 addressed to M. Satyanarayana and 16 others by the Executive Director Bellam- palli intimating them that they have not passed in the test held in January, 1982 at Bellampalli for the post of Clerk Grade II in the Company.
- Ex. M6 Letter dt. 9-4-85 addressed by Sr. Executive Engineer CSP, R.K.P. I, S.C. Co. Ltd., to Addi- tional C.M.E. R.K.P.I. with regard to payment of Officiating allowance to M. Satyanarayana.

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Presiding Officer

[No. L-22012/12/84-D.III(B)]

का. अ. 3996 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) के धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्र सरकार, वेस्टर्न कोल फ़िल्ड्स लि०, कोरबा, बिलासपुर (च. प्र.) के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध विवादकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुसूच में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्र सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट को प्रकशित करत है, जो केन्द्र सरकार को 4-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3996.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of W.C.L. Korba, Bilaspur (M.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI V. S. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL- CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(A)(1)/1985

PARTIES :

Shri Bhojram S/o Shri Kashiram M.S.G. Worker, W.C. Ltd., Surakachar Colliery, Korba Area Panitanki Dafai, Banki, Post Office Banki Mongra, District Bilaspur (M.P.) ... Complainant,

Versus

The General Manager, Western Coalfields Limited, Korba Area Post Office Korba Colliery, District Bilaspur (M.P.) ... Opposite Party Management.

APPEARANCES :

For Complainant—Shri Rambilash Shobhnath.

For Opposite Party—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mining DISTRICT : Bilaspur (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated, October 21, 1986

This is a complaint under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by Shri Bhojram.

2. Facts which are no longer in dispute are that the complainant was working in Surakachar Colliery as a M.S.G. worker. An industrial dispute of the Surakachar Colliery and their M.S.G. Workers, Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(25)/1983 (Reference Notification No. L-22011/35/82-D. III(B) dated 1st July, 1983) is pending before this Tribunal, Schedule of which is as under :—

"Whether there is justification in the demand of Union of WCL, Korba in having Cat. VI for MSG workers in Banki and Surakachar Collieries? If not, are the workers entitled to any additional remuneration or any other relief?"

The workman fell ill and the management as per N.C.W.A. sanctioned Rs. 10,000 for his treatment for Mitral Stenosis operation at Chandigarh. Workman went to Chandigarh for treatment and was treated there. Doctor at Chandigarh however discovered that he is suffering from Leprosy. There- fore they refused to operate him then and advised him to come after an year. He came back and started taking treat- ment in the Surakachar Hospital where he was declared fit for duty. Thereafter he started working in the Mines. How- ever the workman was referred to a Medical Board and the Medical Board declared him unfit for duty. As such his ser- vices were terminated vide letter dated 3rd January, 1985 with effect from 4th February, 1985 which the workman re- ceived on 22nd January, 1985.

3. The case of the complainant further is that earlier he was stopped from doing work with effect from 23rd October, 1984 by the Supervisor (Mines) Shri N. Sharma. He therefore applied to the Area Manager on 9th November, 1984 and he was again taken back on duty from 14th November, 1984. Therefore Supervisor (Mines) Shri N. Sharma managed for his medical check up by the Medical Board to get him declared unfit. His services were terminated without any notice or wages in lieu of notice and he was also deprived of Rs. 10,000 sanctioned for his treatment. He therefore appealed to the Area Manager on 22nd January, 1985 to get him re-examined by the Medical Board as per Rules but without any result. His termination amounts to unfair labour practice and it is against N.C.W.A., Mines Act and Rules and I.D. Act.

4. The Opposite Party management denied that he was stopped from work from 23rd October, 1984. The case of the management further is that the Leprosy is highly contagious disease and the complainant was advised to appear before the Medical Board and he being found unfit for duty his services were terminated. A notice dated 3rd January, 1985 was given to the complainant before termination.

5. I framed the following issues which with my reasons and findings are as under :—

ISSUES

1. (a) Whether Opposite Party management has violated the provisions of Section 33 of I.D. Act?
- (b) If so, whether the complainant is entitled to the relief as claimed?

FINDINGS WITH REASONS

6. Issue No. 1(a) & (b).—In support of his case the complainant workman, Shri Bhojram, gave his own statement and relied on certain documents. Ex. W/1 dated 15th December, 1984 is the sanctioned order of Rs. 10,000 for his treatment. Ex. W/2 is the prescription of the Institute at Chandigarh where he was admitted for ten days for operation of Cordiomy and found to have Leprosy also. Ex. W/3 is the letter dated 5th November, 1984 to Sub-Area Manager when he was stopped from working with effect from 23rd October, 1984. Ex. W/4 dated 3rd January, 1985 is the termination order terminating his services with effect from 4th February, 1985 (alleged notice as per the management). Ex. W/5 is the application dated 22nd January, 1985 of the workman to Sub-Area Manager to get him examined by the Appellate Medical Board. Ex. W/6 and Ex. W/8 are the representations made by the Union to the Deputy C.M.E. Sub-Area Manager and by the workman to the General Manager. Ex. W/7 is the letter of the A.L.C.(C) to the Union that the matter relates to this Tribunal.

7. On the other hand, management has examined Shri R. Mukhopadhyaya, Personnel Officer, who proved Ex. M/1 to Ex. M/3. Ex. M/1 and Ex. M/2 are the Medical Board's opinion that the workman is not in a condition to work either on surface or underground and Ex. M/3 is the copy of termination order Ex. W/4. Thus as I have pointed out earlier the facts are no longer in dispute.

8. The workman has further proved that he was stopped from work earlier also and that he had applied for his case being examined by the Appellate Medical Board.

9. The first question that arises for consideration before this Tribunal whether the management have violated the provisions of Sec. 33 of the I.D. Act? I have already referred to the reference No. 25/83 pending before this Tribunal. The reference in Case No. 25/83 is to the effect that whether the demand of the MSG workers in Banki and Surakachar collieries for Category VI wages by their Union is justified. If not, whether they are entitled to additional remuneration. It is crystal clear that the reference is not connected with the present dispute. It is admitted that the workman is not a protected workman. Therefore his case does not fall under Sub-section (1) and (3) of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Ques-

tion arises whether his case falls in Sub-section (2) of Sec. 33 of the I.D. Act which is being reproduced below :—

"Section 33. Conditions of service, etc. to remain unchanged under certain circumstances during pendency of proceedings—

- (1)
- (2) During the pendency of any such proceeding in respect of an industrial dispute, the employer may, in accordance with the standing orders applicable to a workman concerned in such dispute (or, where there are no such standing orders, in accordance with the terms of the contract, whether express or implied, between him and the workman),—
 - (a) alter in regard to any matter not connected with the dispute, the conditions of service applicable to that workman immediately before the commencement of such proceeding; or
 - (b) for any misconduct not connected with the dispute, discharge or punish, whether by dismissal or otherwise, that workman;

Provided that no such workman shall be discharged or dismissed, unless he has been paid wages for one month and an application has been made by the employer to the authority before which the proceeding is pending for approval of the action taken by the employer.

- (3)
- (4)
- (5)

Admittedly the proceeding in respect of an industrial dispute of MSG workmen of Surakachar for Category VI wages is pending before this Tribunal. But this matter of his termination or alteration of his conditions of service is a matter not connected with the dispute. Therefore the employers could change the service condition of the workman or discharge, punish whether by way of dismissal or otherwise the workman for any misconduct not connected with this dispute but it should be done in accordance with the Standing Orders applicable to the workman or in accordance with the terms of contract expressed or implied where there is no Standing Orders. The management has not been able to point to any Standing Orders which lays down provision for premature retirement. Therefore to my mind the general contract between the employer and employees is that they will be retired when they attained the age of superannuation will apply.

10. According to the complainant's statement and the Medical certificate Ex. M/1 his age is approximately 33-34 years therefore it can by no stretch of imagination be treated the age of superannuation. The proviso to above Subsection (2) lays down two conditions. Firstly that no such workman shall be discharged or dismissed unless he has been paid wages for one month or secondly an application has been made by the employer to the authority before which proceedings are pending for approval of action taken by the employer. In the instant case, admittedly no such application has been filed before this Tribunal for approval of the action taken by the employer. As for having paid one month's wages the management relies on the termination order (Ex. M/3-Ex. W/4). It is dated 3rd January, 1985 and its subject is the termination of service due to medically unfitness whereby his services were terminated with effect from 4th February, 1985.

11. The case of the management is that this order gives him a notice of one month i.e. from 3rd January, 1985 to 4th February, 1985 and it also gives him one month's wages for the above period. To my mind this does not fulfil the condition of the said proviso under Sub-section (2). His services were terminated not with effect from 3rd January, 1985; but from 4th February, 1985. Therefore on the date of termination he should have been awarded one month's wages as a compensation under the proviso to Sub-section (2) of Sec. 33 of the I.D. Act. This having not been done, the management have committed breach of both the provisions of the said proviso to Sub-section (2).

12. Section 35 A of the I.D. Act applies once it is found that the provisions of Sec. 35 has been contravened and this Tribunal is authorised to submit the award to the appropriate Government. The question arises as to what relief is the complainant entitled.

13. I have given my best thoughts and consideration in this regard for and against the workman and the management. Looking to the medical Certificate Ex. M/1 and of Expert report of Chandraiah Ex. W/1, I am of the opinion that it will serve no useful purpose to reinstate the workman because in that case he will neither get the treatment nor he will be able to work. Thus both the parties will suffer from this order if he is reinstated. It will also not serve any useful purpose if it is directed that he should be examined by the appropriate medical board, for such a case I came across a case of our Madhya Pradesh High Court in *Suman Verma V. Nav Biharat Karmachari Sangh* (1968-II-LLJ p. 280) and a case of Hon'ble Supreme Court *Anglo American Direct Tea Trading Co. Ltd. vs. Workmen of Nahangh Tea Estate* (1961-II-LLJ p. 623) wherein it has been laid down that where the order of dismissal or discharge made by the employer is wrongful and unjustified and for some good reason reinstatement of workman is not ordered by the Tribunal, it is quite proper to award compensation and full wages from the date of the order of dismissal to the date of the Tribunal's order and one month's average wage for every year of completed service. To my mind this is a fit case in which such an order for compensation is called for. I accordingly decide and order that the termination of the workman was wrongful and unjustified specially looking to his illnesses and ill health, but as already pointed out reinstatement is not proper. I, therefore, decide these issues accordingly and pass an award that the termination of the workman, Bhojram, with effect from 4th February, 1985 is illegal and improper, therefore instead of being reinstated he is entitled to the following compensation :—

- (a) Full back wages with all ancillary benefits with effect from 4th February, 1985 till the publication of this award;
- (b) From the date of publication of award one month's average wages for each year of his completed service computed from the date of his first appointment in the colliery whether as badli or general mazdoor.
- (c) The management will further pay costs of Rs. 1000 to the workman.

V. S. YADAV, Presiding Officer
[No. L-22011/39/82-D. III(B)]

का. अ. 3997:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मै. सिंगरेणी कोलरेज कं. लिमिटेड, पो. कल्याणखाना जिला आदिलबाद (आन्ध्र-प्रदेश) के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अतिक्रमण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 4-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3997.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, P.O. Kalyanikhan, Dist. Adilabad (A.P.) and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 30 of 1985

BETWEEN

The workman of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
P.O. Kalyanikhan, Adilabad District.

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
P.O. Kalyanikhan, Adilabad District.

APPEARANCES :

Sarvasri Noushad Ali and M. Subramanyam, Advocates
for the Workmen.

Sarvasri K. Srinivasa Murthy, H. K. Saigal and Miss
G. Sudha, Advocates for the Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-21012/4/85.D.III(B), dated 16-5-1985 referred the following dispute under Section 7A and 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited and their workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, in relation to their C. S. Plant of RKP-I Division, in dismissing Md. Mahaboob Ali, Terex Loader Driver from service with effect from 12-10-1984 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workmen entitled?"

This reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 30 of 1985 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The claims statement filed by the workmen would show that he was employed as Lorry Driver in Singareni Collieries Company in the year 1978 and he was keeping good record through and functioning as such in efficient manner. It is also said that recognition of his work he was promoted to Technical Grade C by the Orders of the General Manager on 13-6-1983 and the said promotion was confirmed by the orders passed by the General Manager on 29-9-1983 but the workman was dismissed by orders dated 11-10-1984 passed by the General Manager, Mandamarri and Ramakrishnapur Division on illegal and untenable grounds. The charge-sheet dated 22-5-1984 was prepared and signed on behalf of Executive Engineer alleging that on 12-12-1982 at 11.30 P.M. the workman drove lorry No. API 3368 in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against a motor cyclist and that he was convicted in the Munsiff Magistrate Court, Luxitipet under Section 304 IPC and Section 241 Cr. P.C. In fact he gave a detailed explanation denying the said allegation and also explained the circumstances under which the alleged incident took place. It is also contended by him that the Enquiry Officer did not give him fair and reasonable opportunity. According to him the order of dismissal is unsustainable either in law or on facts. It is vehemently contended that the charge sheet is not signed on behalf of the Executive Engineer and it lacks competency and without jurisdiction and that the Executive Engineer is also incompetent in this regard and thus the order of dismissal is abinitio void.

Further it is said that the punishment is predetermined and the same is liable to be declared invalid and bad-in-law; the enquiry report is not based on any evidence; there is no material before the enquiry officer and his findings are thus baseless and arbitrary. The workman is an active worker of Singareni Collieries Motor Drivers Association. There was a strike of the Drivers in Ramakrishnapur II Division from 21-2-1984 to 4-3-1984 consequent of the suspension of one A. Amarendrachary, a Driver. A settlement was arrived at in the discussions held on 4-3-1984 and that among other things the Management would not victimise the drivers who resorted to strike. As the workman was an active participant the Management borne grudge against him and as a result the proceedings were initiated immediately in the month of May 1984 while the alleged misconduct was on 12-12-1982 and the Criminal Court conviction is on 20-12-1982. Thus the action is initiated to victimise the workman. At any rate it is contended that do not constitute

misconduct under the Standing Orders of the company. Finally it is said that the dismissal is severe and disproportionate more so when the past record of the workman is clean.

3. The Management denied all these allegations and it is said that the Company followed the procedure and he was given full and fair opportunity to defend himself and on the basis of the record and also on the basis of conviction by the Court under Section 304 IPC he was found guilty of the offences levelled against him. The findings of the Criminal Court in C.C. No. 568/82 are part of the record. The Executive Engineer of C.S.P. being head of the department is fully competent to issue charge sheets to the erring workmen. There are no material irregularities and legalities as alleged. The Management is not aware of the petitioner as an active workers of S. C. Motor Drivers Association and at no time the said Union intimated to the Management to treat him as protected workman. The Petitioner took up this stand only to cover up the mistake the allegation that the Management bore grudge against him as such the Management initiated action two years later is only an after-thought, and there is no intended victimisation by the Management. The orders passed by the Management as per law and proceedings of the Company and therefore it is also not severe and disproportionate.

4. To decide the preliminary point whether the domestic enquiry was held properly or not. The management examined one witness as M.W. 1 and marked Exs. M1 to M6 while the Workman examined himself as W.W. 1 and marked Exs. W1 to W3.

5. Now after hearing both sides and also after perusing the material on record it was held that by an order dated 18-9-1986 that the domestic enquiry was held fair and proper. It is part of the record.

6. Thereafterwards no further evidence is adduced. The point for consideration now is to see whether there is any material illegality in the evidence which vitiates the punishment. It is held that in the domestic enquiry that the Executive Engineer is competent authority and that he had jurisdiction enquire into the matter he being the General Manager of Mandamarri and Ramakrishnapur Division. But Sri Naushad Ali pointed out that some body signed for Executive Engineer as could be seen under Ex. M1 and the Executive Engineer did not sign the said charge sheet and therefore it is vitiated. The charge sheet Ex. M1 would show that it is signed for Executive Engineer Ramakrishnapur by some body. Now the enquiry proceedings are marked as Exs. M3 and M4 and M5 is the document filed by the Management showing that compensation was awarded to the Petitioner who was the legal representatives when one S. Bhoj Rao died due to incident involving him while coming on motor-bike dashed by the lorry driven by the said Mahboob Ali. In fact Ex. M5 would itself show that the Management filed a counter that they are the owner of the lorry API 3368 and Mahboob Ali was the Driver and the third respondent was Insurance Company with whom the vehicle was insured and said Driver Mahboob Ali informed the Management that the accident occurred as a result of negligence on the part of the deceased. It is also mentioned that as per the information available with the Management the deceased was not maintaining good health and he was addicted to alcohol and his lungs were damaged and that he had undergone abdominal operation in Hyderabad prior to two or three years to his death and it is also mentioned that Mahboob Ali was a Licensed Driver and that they are not liable for any accident caused and if any compensation is payable it is to be paid out of the insurance coverage by the Insurance Company. Mahboob Ali filed a counter adopting the counter filed by the Management and the Insurance Company contended that the deceased himself was at fault and he was not earning anything.

7. On this the Court relying upon the judgement in C.C. No. 568/82 on the file of Judicial First Class Magistrate, Luttitpet that Mahboob Ali was convicted on his own plea of guilty held that the driver was driving the vehicle rashly and negligently and thus the accident occurred. Thus it is

based upon the judgement in C.C. No. 568/82 on the file of Judicial First Class Magistrate, Luttitpet which is marked as Ex. M6. Ex. M6 would show the accused admitted the allegation or charges in the first instance and that on the plea of guilt of the accused, it is accepted as being true and voluntary; and sentenced him to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000.00 in default to suffer simple imprisonment for six months. This judgement Ex. M6 is dated 20th December 1982 while the accident took place on the mid-night of 12-12-1982 at 11.30 P.M. In fact the insurance compensation case was settled on 28-1-1985 under Ex. M5 in O.P. 61/83 on the file of District Judge Adilabad and in the both the Management as well as Driver took a stand the said plea of voluntary admission of guilt was not a correct fact indirectly and contested the same stating there was no rash or negligence on the part of the Driver of Singareni Colliery and they took a stand that the Motor Cycle rider Bhoj Rao was at fault but the learned Judge simply believed Ex. M6 judgement copy and held that there was rash and negligent act on the part of the Driver Mahboob Ali. In fact Ex. M2 is the explanation given by him to the charge. The Driver mentioned that he was advised by the Departmental Officers and other Court attendants to admit the offence before the Court of law and therefore he admitted the offence. According to him Bhoj Rao was not in sound condition to drive the vehicle and he was also out of control over the brakes and clutch of the vehicle. So he was advised that it is only an accident and was asked to accept the guilt and unintentionally he accepted the same and the court also convicted him to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000.00 without going into the merits of the case instead of sentencing him to prison and he also mentioned that due to pressure of the Police he admitted the said offence. He mentioned that he was serving the Company for the last eight years efficiently and he should not be punished twice for the same offence and he wanted therefore the Management to take a lenient view of the matter and to pardon him as he admitted the offence only because of pressure from all sides. Now he also deposed to the same affect in this Tribunal. The very fact that the management contended that the Singareni Collieries Driver is not at fault as is seen in Ex. M5 counter filed by them and when the judgement in Ex. M5 is only based upon the Ex. M6 certified copy of the judgement of the Criminal Court, it is not correct to say that the management was really bent upon holding the accused guilty of any offence for "habitual negligence" as is sought or is now done under Clause 16(16) of the Standing Orders of the Company. Moreover the dismissal order is dated 19-11-1984 and the Criminal Court Judgement is dated 20-12-1982 if the management really or bona fide wanted in proceeding with the case by filing a charge as shown under Ex. M1 there was no necessity for them to wait till 22/26-5-1984 when the alleged charge sheet said to be issued for the Executive Engineer. In fact the compensation case was filed in as O.P. No. 61/83 and the counter was filed by the Management of Singareni Collieries Company denying that Mahboob Ali was involved in rash and negligent act. Evidently in 1983 or in 1984 before the charge sheet is issued to Mahboob Ali. So the same Management having filed a statement in O.P. No. 61/83 and the counter was filed by the Management of is not responsible for any rash and negligent act. It is surprising and unimaginable how the Management came forward with a charge sheet once again departmentally under Ex. M1 that for the incident said to have been taken place on 12-12-1982 that it amounted to misconduct under Standing Orders of the Company Clauses 16(6) and 16(19). First of all under Clause 16(6) it must be offence of habitual negligence or neglect of work. There is no proof of habitual negligence or neglect of work. It is not at all the case of the Management that Mahboob Ali is involved in habitual negligence or neglect of work. The evidence of Mahboob Ali would show that he was promoted as Driver Ramakrishnapur-I in 1979 though he was working as coal filler from 1975 and further promoted as Terax Loader Driver Grade C on 13-6-1983 and he marked the same as Ex. W1, and the promotion was also confirmed stating that his probation period was completed on 29/30-9-1983. In fact he produced the original in correct and filed the xerox copy of it as Ex. W2. Thus it would show that there was no whisper of habitual negligence or neglect of work and the Management filed counter in the compensation case taking that the Driver Mahboob Ali was liable for the said act with open eyes when there was a conviction on him under Ex. M6 on the

basis of his own admission of guilt. The Management did not come forward to say that the Driver himself is liable for the compensation payable apart from the Insurance Company as he admitted the guilt in the Criminal Court. The Management took a clear stand that he was not guilty at all knowing fully well that there is a judgement holding him to be guilty on his own admission. In this context the explanation given by Mahboob Ali is relevant that he was forced and pressurised to admit the guilt though he was not guilty and that Court also took into consideration all the circumstances and convicted him to pay only a fine of Rs. 1,000.00 that there was no material placed before the Court to show that vehicle was at fault that he was rash and negligent in driving while the other person was in the right direction. In fact the stand taken by the Management itself would show under Ex. M5 that the said Bhoj Rao was addicted to cigarette and alcohol and he was not maintaining good health and his lungs were damaged and that the deceased also undergone serious abdominal operation in Hyderabad two or three years prior to his death and the accident occurred as a result of gross negligence on the part of the deceased. So having taken such a stand in 1983 O.P. No. 61/83 which is indicated in Ex. M5 it is surprising that the management gave a charge sheet in 1984 under Ex. M1 after lapse of two years after the incident that he was guilty for misconduct under Clauses 16(6) and 16(19) of the Standing Orders of the Company.

8. Had the management took a stand that Mahboob Ali himself is responsible for admission of guilt and that in view of the Criminal Court judgement he himself is liable to pay compensation along with the Insurance Company with whom the lorry was insured in O.P. No. 61/83 on the file of the District Judge, it would have been right for issuing a charge sheet that he misconducted himself by driving the vehicle rashly and negligently. The management cannot take one stand by filing counter in O.P. No. 61/83 supporting Mahboob Ali and after the compensation was awarded without any evidence on their side basing upon the Criminal Court judgement they cannot come forward with a charge sheet that he misconducted himself under the Standing Orders of the Company.

9. Even otherwise it cannot be a habitual negligence or neglect of work as contemplated under Standing Order to hold him guilty for the incident said to have been reported on 12-12-1982 at 11.30 P.M. involving the motorcyclists coming from opposite direction. Similarly under Clause 16(19) it cannot be said that there was any breach of Indian Mines Act or any other Act or any rule or byelaws thereunder under Standing Orders of the Company. Under Clause 16(9) any breach of any other Act and rules did not mean that his involvement in the accident basing upon Ex. M6 is a ground to hold that he is involved of offence connected to the Standing Orders. After all his involvement in the accident has nothing to do with his duties as Terex Loader Driver of which he was confirmed after the incident knowing fully well that he was convicted by Criminal offence on 20-12-1982 under Ex. M6. He was confirmed under Ex. W2 on 13-9-1983 whereas the First Class Magistrate conviction under Ex. M6 is dated 20-12-1982. So if it come under any breach of any act as contemplated under Clause 16(9) to hold it as a misconduct when there is clear conviction dated 20-12-1982 under Ex. M6 how is it that they gave him promotion and confirmed him as per Ex. W1 and W2? Therefore it is absurd that he committed any breach of any other Act. In this context the explanation given by Mahboob Ali under Ex. M2 seeking mercy that he was pressurised by Police and others to admit the guilt gives a correct picture bearing for all the circumstances where the Management is thus prevented from taking a contrary stand in the entire matter. Further to hold him that he is guilty there is no charge sheet that he is guilty of misconduct under Standing Orders 16(15). Even under Clause 16(15) any conviction in a court of law for any criminal offence involving "moral turpitude" amounts to misconduct. First of all there is no charge sheet under Section 16(15) as seen under Ex. W1. Even first part of the allegations under Ex. W1 are violation of Section 16(15) it is clear that the said offence involved is not offence involving moral turpitude and that is why the management had rightly excluded the

alleged allegation under Clause 16(15) also while framing the alleged charge at a belated stage.

10. Further the workman adduced evidence that the charge sheet is based as a kind of victimisation as he participated in the strike that took place between 21-2-1984 to 4-3-1984 when one Amerandachary consequent of his suspension as driver that he is himself active worker of S.C. Motor Drivers Association and that a settlement was arrived at in the discussion 4-3-1984 and the management also agreed not to victimise the Driver who resorted to strike. It is the case of Mahboob Ali as there was understanding that the Drivers who participated in the said strike should not be victimised the management took upon the old case which was two years old in which the Management filed a statement denying that he was not involved in the rash and negligent act and that Bhoj Rao was actually rash and negligent due to other bad habits was responsible for the incident came forward with their charge sheet for alleged incident dated 12-12-1982 and thus it amounts to victimisation. The management could not deny the suggestion that there was no such strike of drivers of Ramakrishnapur-II Division from 21-2-1984 to 4-3-1984 that Mahboob Ali mentioned that he is an active member and he mentioned there is a settlement on 4-3-1984 the management did not say anything about it. So the oral evidence of Mahboob Ali and claims statement filed by him would substantiate that it is a case of victimisation done indirectly by taking up an old incident as they could not take action for participation in the Drivers strike as per the Settlement. Thus the averment in the claims statement coupled to the substantial data furnished by the Driver Mahboob Ali would show that the management did this as act of victimisation by taking up old case in which they themselves denied that he was not responsible for rash and negligent act in O.P. No. 61/83 as per Ex. M5. Further when charge is not signed by Executive Engineer and when it is signed by some body for him. It is not a valid charge. Ex. M1 shows that it is signed "for Executive Engineer" by some body and it is not explained who is this person who signed it. So it is not a proper charge sheet issued it must be held that the charge itself is abinitio void. Thus on a careful consideration of the entire material I hold that the action of the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited in dismissing Md. Mahboob Ali, Terex Loader Driver from service with effect from 12-10-1984 is not justified and that he is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages and other attendant benefits.

Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal this the 15th day of October, 1986.

Sd/-
Presiding Officer

Appendix of Evidence

Witness Examined for the Management :	Witness Examined for the Workmen :
--	---------------------------------------

M.W. S. Janardhan Rao	W.W. Md. Mahboob Ali
-----------------------	----------------------

Documents marked for the Management :

- Ex. M1 Charge sheet dt. 22-26-5-84 issued to Md. Mahboob Ali Driver by the Executive Engineer, CSP, RKP.
- Ex. M2 Explanation to the charge sheet dt. 27-5-84. given by Md. Mahboob Ali, Driver to the Executive Engineer, S.C. Company Limited, CSP, RKP.
- Ex. M3 Enquiry Proceedings.
- Ex. M4 Enquiry Report.
- Ex. M5 Photostat copy of the Judgement in OP No. 61/83 dt. 28-1-85 on the file of District Judge, Adilabad.
- Ex. M6 Photostat copy of the Judgement in C.C. No. 568/82, dt. 20-12-82 on the file of Judicial Magistrate of First Class Luxettipet.

Documents marked for the Workmen :

- Ex. W1 Photostat copy of the Office Order dt. 13-6-83 issued to Md. Mahboob Ali and 2 others by the General Manager, MM & RKP Area, S.C. Co. Ltd.
- Ex. W2 Photostat copy of the Officer Order dt. 29-9-83 issued to Mahboob Ali and Syed Abdullah by the General Manager MM & RKP., S.C. Co. Ltd.
- Ex. W3 Photostat copy of the discussions held on 4-3-84 in the Office of Executive Director, S.C. Co. Ltd., Bellampalli Area between the Management of S.C. Co. Ltd., Bellampalli Area and the President, T.C.M.L. Union, Bellampalli, along with the representatives of the drivers, Bellampalli.

Dated : 22-10-1986

J. VENUGOPAL RAO, Presiding Officer

[No. L-21012/4/85-D.III(B)]

का. अ. 3998:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मै. सिंगरेनी कोलरीज कं. लिमिटेड, कोठागुडम डिविजन, जिला करमनगर (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधि-करण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करते हैं, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 4-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 3998.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Companies Limited, Kothagudem Division, Distt. Khammam (A.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL)
AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 34 of 1985

BETWEEN:

The Workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem, Khammam District.

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem, Khammam District.

APPEARANCES:

Sri D. S. R. Varma, Advocate — for the Workmen.

Sarvasri K. Srinivasa Murthy, H.K. Saigal and Miss G. Sudha, Advocates—for the Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-21011/5/85-D.III.B dated 2-5-1985 referred the following dispute under Sections 10(1) (d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem and their workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Kothagudem Division is justified in refusing to supply Rain and Warm Coats to the workmen of Aerial Rope Way and Sand Gathering Stations? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?”

The reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 34 of 1985 and notices were issued to both the parties.

2. The workman filed a claims statement stating that they are working at Aerial Rope Way and Sand Gathering Station performing their jobs in open place and are facing lot of troubles to regularise their jobs during rainy season and as well as during winter season. It is mentioned in the petition that the Aerial Rope Way is situated nearest the jungle area and the Sand Gathering Station is situated completely in jungle area. Since the Sand Gathering Station is situated near the river the workmen working at Sand Gathering Station are performing their duties at river surrounding. It is also mentioned that if there is any breakdown between the Aerial Rope Way and Sand Gathering Station, the workmen are attending breakdown in jungle area as the rope was situated completely in jungle area and it is 10 kilometers length. They are attending breakdowns even though there is heavy rain and cold to put the work into the track. The workmen working at Aerial Rope Way and Sand Gathering Station are attending hazardous jobs irrespective of the heavy rains and heavy cold in open place and in the jungle, they are rightly entitled for rain coats and warm coats.

3. The counter filed by the Management, it is mentioned that from time to time when wage revisions are made, National Coal Wage Agreement is applicable to these employees and whatever wage was increased it was given to them. The wages were fixed as per the Coal Wage Board Regulations and the Workmen are not entitled to claim benefits like rain coats and warm coats. It is respectfully submitted that there is no hazardous nature of work done by these workmen and the workmen are fully aware of nature of duties they are performing since beginning. Moreover the warm coats and rain coats are not protective equipment. There is no law or rules made by the State or Central Governments to provide warm coats and rain coats to the workmen on the ground that they are working on hazardous nature of duties subject to heavy rains and heavy cold. There was a settlement arrived at on 25-1-1964 whereunder they were supplied with warm clothing. The Settlement is thus binding upon them. Thus the Petitioner-Union is re-agitating the issue and claimed the demand to extend the facility to the workmen working at Aerial Ropeway and Sand Gathering Station and the same is not justifiable; it will create serious anomaly in the administration if the alleged facility is to be extended irrespective of any norms; the work force being about 90,000 severe repercussions will be there in the Company.

4. The reference was made to this Tribunal on 29-5-1985 and infact both sides were given notices while the matter was referred to this Tribunal to appear before this Tribunal on 28-6-1985 itself. The workmen counsel filed vakalat on 13-8-1985 and wanted time for filing claims statement. The Management counsel filed vakalat on 14-11-1985. In other words while the workers counsel took time for about three months from the date of reference for filing the vakalat, the Management counsel took time for about six months to file vakalat. Then the workers Counsel filed claims statement on 23-12-1985, that means, the workmen counsel had taken four months time to file claims statement after he filed vakalat. The Management filed counter on 17-2-1986 i.e. that means the management has taken another three months after six months for filing vakalat is filed to file the counter. Now from 17-2-1986 onwards the matter was posted for enquiry. From 17-2-1986 it is adjourned to 27-3-1986, 2-5-1986, 4-6-1986. It is mentioned on 4-6-1986 that negotiations were going on between the workmen and the Management and they requested time for filing the Settlement till 28-7-1986. On 28-7-1986 also Management Counsel Miss G. Sudha mentioned that negotiations are still going on between the workmen and the management and requested time for adjournment. Thus after more than one year, i.e. on 28-7-1986 this Tribunal after giving two adjournment for reporting settlement as mentioned it is observed that either they should finally report settlement or be ready for enquiry and posted the matter to 29-8-1986 i.e. for about one more month and still the parties persisted in seeking time for settlement.

5. On 6-9-1986 Management counsel filed M.P. No. 308/86 stating that they filed a petition in I.D. No. 41 of 1985 on

3-9-1986 and they did not want to proceed further in the above matter as they are moving application of transfer of all their cases and as such wanted that the matter should be deferred.

6. Of course order in M.P. 278/86 dated 4-9-86 in I.D. No. 41 of 1985 were passed by this Tribunal itself stating that all or any other matters pending before me in which Miss G. Sudha representing along with Sri K. Srinivasa Murthy as Management counsel or where both of them appear together for the Management cannot be stayed on such frivolous petitions and the said petition was rejected and it is also mentioned that all the matters will be proceeded in accordance with law. This was passed in open Court in the presence of the Management Personal Officers who were present along with the counsel Kum. D. V. Lakshmi representing Miss. G. Sudha. The matter was adjourned to 4-10-1986. In fact, the orders passed in M.P. No. 278/86 dated 4-9-86 were questioned in Hon'ble High Court by way of Writ Petition and its final orders were passed on stay petition and there is no stay in the matter. Thus it has nothing to do with their case and M.P. 308/86 is rejected.

7. In other words even after filing M.P. No. 308/86 on 6-9-1986 which was rejected on the same day, no orders were received either transferring this matter or showing that any steps were taken by the management as alleged for transferring "this matter" for best reasons known to themselves. Further both parties and their counsel called absent and there was no representation.

8. Having taken the stand that they are going to file settlement as early as on 4-6-1986 and even after four months they could not file the so called settlement in Tribunal and further the Management tried to comformward with a petition in M.P. No. 308/86 and the same was also rejected and roughly for about one month thereafterwards i.e. till 4-10-1986 as there was no representation from both sides and there was no settlement filed by them since it is an old matter pending for a long time and as both parties did not evince any interest in adducing evidence or ready for arguing the matter since 14-2-1986, this Tribunal is left with no other alternative but to terminate the reference holding that the workmen are not entitled for any relief for their own latches as they did not adduce any evidence to substantiate their claims.

Reference is terminated.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 4th day of October, 1986.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

Appendix of Evidence

NIL

Dated: 27-10-86.

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Presiding Officer

[No. L-21011/5/85-D. III(B)]

नई दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 1986

का. आ. 3999:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एस. ए. आई. एल. के राऊरकेला स्टील प्लांट की कालदा आयरन ओर माईन, राऊरकेला (उड़ीसा) के प्रबंधन से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, भुवनेश्वर, के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-10-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 18th November, 1986

S.O. 3999.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal Bhubaneswar as shown in relation to the management of Kalta Iron Ore Mine of Rourkela Steel Plant of SAIL, Rourkela (Orissa) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 31st October, 1986.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ORISSA, BHUBANESWAR
Industrial Dispute Case Nos. 9/81 & 10/81 (Central)

Bhubaneswar, Dated the 23rd October, 1986

BETWEEN

Chief Engineer, (OMO),

Rourkela Steel Plant of SAIL,

P.O. Rourkela-11, District Sundergarh, Orissa.

.....First Party.

AND

Workmen represented by the

Secretary, United Mines Mazdoor

Union, P.O. Tensa, District Sundergarh, Orissa.

.....Second Party.

APPEARANCES :

Shri B. Panda, Dy. Manager.....for the First Party.

Sri S. N. Mudali, Vice President.....

Sri S. R. Ghose, Advocate.....For the Second Party.

AWARD

1. These are two references under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 made by the Central Government for adjudication vide order Nos. L-26011/14/80-III.B and L-26011/14/80-D, IIIB. The terms of references in both the cases are same and may be quoted as follows :—

"Whether the Management of Kalta Iron Ore Mine of Rourkela Steel Plant of Steel Authority of India are justified in not regularising the piece rated workmen who have qualified to do so in terms of the Standing Orders applicable to the mines. If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled ?"

2. The case of the workmen is that they have been working in Kalta Iron Ore Mine of Rourkela Steel Plant of Steel Authority of India since 1967 against permanent jobs as temporary piece rated workmen. They are the members of the United Mines Mazdoor Union which is a registered union. These piece rated workmen were classified and declared as temporary workmen by the management since 1974. As provided in sub-clauses (a) and (d) of Clause 3 of the Certified Standing Orders of Kalta Iron Ore Mines the said workmen have put in qualifying service to be declared as permanent workmen. Some other workmen junior to the said workmen and who worked only for above 12 months have been made permanent and promoted to higher posts and allowed benefits available to the permanent workmen employed in the said Mines. As the management did not consider the demands these workmen raised this dispute. Before the Conciliation Officer the management remained adamant. Finally it is stated that the refusal on the part of the management in regularising the piece-rated workmen who have qualified themselves in terms of the Standing Orders in respect thereof is illegal, bad in law, malafide, motivated and unjustified.

3. The stand of the management is that the reference is misconceived and not maintainable. The Rourkela Steel Plant, it is stated followed the recognised procedures for sanction of posts, recruitment etc. The usual procedure therefore, is first a post in the particular category is sanctioned with the approval of the competent authority. Thereafter the vacancy is notified to the local Employment Exchange. Candidates sponsored by the Employment Exchange in response to such

notification of vacancies are interviewed for purpose of selection by a duly constituted selection committee. The candidates selected and recommended are issued with appointment offers subject to medical fitness and other verifications as per the terms and conditions of appointment offer. These procedure are to be followed.

4. The further case of the management is that Kalta Iron Mines was initially decided to be a temporary establishment and for this purpose some persons were employed on adhoc and piece rated and on casual basis and subsequently declared temporary. For recruitment of these posts the usual procedure was not followed. After study of the operation of the Mines permanent posts were sanctioned. The candidates already working on piece rate basis were required to attend interview for selection, against the newly created regular posts by a duly constituted committee. In June, 1979 about 59 such candidates who appeared at the interview were selected for appointment against regular vacancies and were issued with appointment officers. They were also required to appear for medical examination. In April, 1981, 143 workers appeared for interview and were also selected for appointment. The management is always prepared to consider the cases of all the piece rated and temporary workers for appointment against regular posts subject to prevailing procedures and conditions. The union representing the present workmen desires regularisation of the temporary workers without following the recognised procedure and the rules which according to the management apart from creating industrial unrest will unsettle a settled position in the mines.

5. The undisputed facts are that the workmen covered by this proceeding are piece-rated workers and have been declared as temporary. The management as indicated earlier has no objection to give them appointment against permanent posts subject to their attending the interview and undergoing medical examination. The stand of the workmen however is that they had undergone the formalities prior to their appointment as piece-rated workers and it would not be necessary for them to either attending the interview or the medical test. It is admitted case of both the parties that on 22-4-84 several disputes between the management and the workman were settled and the settlement was reduced into writing vide Ext. A. One of the terms of settlement was as follows :

"The existing PRWs who have completed one year of service in their existing post will be regularised in accordance with the normal procedure and the union agreed to render all cooperation in this regard. In consideration of the long years of service rendered by the present temporary PRWs only a formal procedure for regularisation will be held at Tansa hospital of Rourkela Steel Plant. The interposition of all regular PRWs including those who will be regularised will be recast notionally taking into account their initial date of appointment as Temporary PRWs. Such seniority list will be published as per the rules. Those who actually disqualify will continue to work as Temporary PRWs."

6. It would appear from the aforesaid settlement that the piece-rated workers would be regularised in accordance with the normal procedure. It also appears that having regard to long years of service rendered by the workers only a formal procedure would be followed. Medical examinations for regularisation were also agreed to be held. It has also been agreed that those who actually disqualify will continue to work as temporary piece-rated workers. These being the terms of settlement it does not lie for the union to contend that the workmen are not required to observe the normal procedure i.e. attending the interview and appearing for medical examination. Before their services are regularised. In my opinion the stand of the management is consistent with the terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties. The workmen have no doubt qualified for regularisation as far as their period of service is concerned. That however does not entitle them to say that they would not undergo the normal procedure which they agreed to observe under the settlement date 22-4-84. Since the workmen refused to undergo the normal procedure the management was justified in not regularising them. It is still open to the workmen to

submit to the normal procedure i.e. attending the interview and undergoing the medical tests. The management on the observance of those procedure shall take steps to regularise the services of the piece rated workmen.

7. An award be passed accordingly.

R. N. PANDA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-26011/14/80-DIII(B)]

का. आ. 4000 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार में चिक-एन-मेट, स्टील अथॉरिटी ऑफ इंडिया लि. के कैंटिन ठेकेदार, कलकत्ता के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में श्री एस. एन. मोहन्ती, क्षेत्रीय श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रिय) तथा आर्बिट्रेटर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करता है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 4000.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of Shri S. N. Mohanty, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Calcutta and Arbitrator as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Chick-N-Meat, Canteen Contractor of Steel Authority of India Limited, Calcutta and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5-11-1986.

BEFORE THE REGIONAL LABOUR COMMISSIONER
(CENTRAL), CALCUTTA AND ARBITRATOR

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to M/s. Chick-N-Meat (Canteen Contractor of Steel Authority of India Limited), 62/3, Tollygunge Road, Calcutta-700033.

AND

Their workmen represented by Calcutta Dock Workers Union (HMS), 27/B, Circular Garden Reach Road, Calcutta-700023.

APPEARANCES :

For the Management : Shri Tara Shankar Chowdhury, Proprietor.

For the Workmen : Shri Bacha Prasad, General Secretary.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Docks

No. 1/1/86-B.I

Dated the 27th October, 1986

AWARD

The Central Government vide their order No. L-26015/1/86-D.III(B) dated the 28th April, 1986 has referred the following dispute for my arbitration under section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

- (i) Revision of monthly salary of group 'A', group 'B', group 'C' and group 'D' workers.
- (ii) 30 days P.L. and 15 days C.L. for all the Mistries and Canteen boys in a year.
- (iii) One rain coat should be given to the canteen boys who will be engaged for outdoor points.
- (iv) One woollen sweater to all the Mistries and canteen boys in every alternative year or Rs. 45/- in lieu thereof.
- (v) Two sets of full pants and two sets of full shirts to all the Mistries and canteen boys in a year or Rs. 200/- in lieu thereof.

- (vi) Yearly bonus to all the Mistries and canteen boys @10%.
- (vii) All the Mistries and canteen boys should be paid Rs. 20/- per month per head as washing allowance.
- (viii) Provident Fund should be deducted at the rate of 8.33 per cent of the basic wages of both the Mistries and canteen boys.
- (ix) 19 days working holidays including five National holidays should be given to all the Mistries and canteen boys.
- (x) On working holidays and on roster off, the payment should be made to both the Mistries and canteen boys equal to the rate of their salary.
- (xi) Overtime should be paid in double the wages to both the Mistries and canteen boys.
- (xi) Wages slip and identity card should be issued to all the workmen.
- (xiii) Duty hours of all the workmen should be 8 hours.
- (xiv) Payment should be made to all the workmen on or before 10th of every month.

2. The parties were called upon to file their written comments, endorsing copy to the other party. The management filed their written comments dated 19-6-86 on 23-6-86 and the union filed their written comments dated 30-6-86 on 1-1-86. Thereafter hearing were held on 18-7-86, 6-8-86, 8-9-86 and finally on 18-9-86.

3. During the course of hearing, the representative of the workmen stated that they would not like to press their demands contained in item No. 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 14 relating to supply of rain coat, supply of woollen sweater, Provident Fund, working holidays, wage slips/identity cards, duty hours of 8 hours duration and payment of wages on or before 10th of every month, as those issues have already been mutually settled between the union and the management.

4. Regarding item No. 10, both the parties agreed that the employer would pay pro-rata wages i.e. normal wage only, to a workman for working holiday or on a roster off day.

5. Regarding item No. 11, the employer without entering into much argument agreed to pay overtime wages at double the rate of ordinary rate of wages when the workmen would be working on overtime beyond their normal 8 hours work.

6. The remaining items which were left for my arbitration are 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7, relating to revision of monthly salary, leave, uniform, bonus and washing allowance, which are discussed serially below :—

Item No. 1, Revision of salary :

The union demanded the following wages :

Category of workers.	Existing wages.	Wages demanded
1	2	3
1- Cook	Rs. 413.00 P.M.	Rs. 834.00 per month
2. Boy	Rs. 395.00 P.M.	Rs. 798.00 per month.

In support of this, the union stated that in the Port Trust canteen a cook gets a total salary of Rs. 964.94 paise per month and a cook in the canteen of Steel Authority of India Ltd. gets Rs. 815.40 paise per month. A canteen boy in the canteen of the Port Trust and Steel Authority of India Ltd. gets Rs. 602/- per month.

7. At present, there are three categories of canteen boys with this employer who are categorised as 'B', 'C' and 'D'. 'B' category gets Rs. 395 per month, 'C' category gets Rs. 335 per month and 'D' category gets Rs. 287 per month. The union demanded that all these categories should be

merged into one category and should be given wages of Rs. 798 per month.

8. The management, on the other hand, argued that the present wage rates as indicated by the union were arrived at as per an agreement with this union on 1-4-85. Taking into consideration the subsidy that was agreed between the canteen contractor and his principal. Besides, this monthly salary the employer also pays Rs. 60/- per head per worker who does not stay in the canteen premises. As the paying capacity of the employer is governed by the subsidy by his principal i.e. Steel Authority of India Ltd., which has not been increased since the agreement, he pleaded incapacity to bear any extra burden on this account. He further submitted that more than 25 per cent of the subsidy is spent on the staff of the canteen. The example of Port Trust and Steel Authority of India Ltd. canteens are not comparable with the contractor establishment as those canteens are more or less departmental canteens and do not run depending on this subsidy.

9. The union submitted that as they are not party to any contract in the matter of running of the canteen they had no knowledge about the quantum of subsidy etc. and his limitations due to the subsidy he gets from his principal. The Government had fixed minimum rates of wages for various categories of workers, even an ordinary earth cutter gets Rs. 20-25 per head per day and a Mason Rs. 30-35 per head per day. The canteen employees wages are so low that it is difficult for them to maintain themselves specially when the cost of living index during the last two years has considerably gone up.

10. The employer commented that the price level having gone up considerably, the cost of materials used in the canteen have also increased. Hence, it has become practically impossible to run the canteen service with the fixed subsidy that is paid to him by his principal.

11. In reply to the demand for wage revision of these employees, I am of the opinion that besides the cook, there should be two categories of canteen boys who may be termed as Canteen boy grade 'B' and 'C' only instead of three categories as at present. Keeping in view the fact that the contractor for running the Canteen has to depend on the subsidy of the principal and hence cannot be compared with a departmental canteen and keeping in view the nature of work and cost of living index etc. I feel, it will be fair and reasonable that a cook should get Rs. 550 per month as wages and a canteen boy grade 'B' should get Rs. 500 per month and a Canteen boy grade 'C' should get Rs. 450 per month as wages. In this connection, it may be mentioned that an unskilled workman to which category a canteen boy belongs is entitled to daily wage of Rs. 15 per day (Rs. 390 for 26 working days in a month) in Calcutta area as per the Government of West Bengal.

Item No. 2, Privilege leave and casual leave

12. The union demanded that the employees be allowed 30 days privilege leave and 15 days casual leave in a year and argued that provision of casual leave is essential to meet with such eventualities like sudden sickness etc.

13. The employer stated that the workmen at present are getting 30 days leave with wages in a year. During the leave period, the employer has to either engage existing employee by paying overtime wages or to engage casual hands and therefore, it would not be possible for him to increase the existing leave facilities.

14. Under the welfare provisions of different labour legislations, a worker is normally entitled to leave at the rate of one day for 20 days work after he puts in 240 days attendance. In comparison to the above provision, I find that the existing quantum of leave is justified and therefore, do not award any increase in the quantum of leave. I, however, feel that out of 30 days leave that is being enjoyed at present 10 days in a year should be treated as casual leave and 20 days as privilege leave with full pay which can be accumulated upto 40 days. The casual leave will expire after the end of year if not availed of during the year.

Item No. 5. Uniform.

15. The union demanded 2 sets of uniform consisting of full pants and half shirt of terricotton fabrick every year as one set that is being supplied at present is not sufficient and does not allow any time to the employees to property wash them and iron those before use.

16. The employer submitted that the employees used to get two full pants and half shirts of cotton fabrick every year. But on the last occasion at the special request of the employees, he agreed to supply them one set of terricotton full pant and half shirt in lieu of two sets of cotton fabrick uniforms, even though, he had to incur an extra expenditure of Rs. 30-40/- per head on this account. It is, therefore, not possible for him to increase the number of uniform.

17. It is necessary that a person should have two sets of uniform at a time so that he does not face any difficulty in their washing etc. I, therefore, award that two sets of terricotton uniform i.e. full pants and half shirts be supplied to the employees, every alternate year.

Item No. 6. Bonus.

18. The union demands 10 per cent of wages as bonus every year. The employer in his written reply has agreed to abide by the provision of law in this regard.

19. Since the employer has agreed to follow the provisions of Payment of Bonus Act, 1963 in the matter of payment of bonus to those employees, I consider his offer as fair and reasonable and do not want to interfere with the offer.

Item No. 7. Washing allowance.

20. The union demanded a washing allowance at the rate of Rs. 20/- per head per month, as the price of washing soap and the rate of ironing of cloths have increased considerably.

21. The employer stated that at present, he is paying Rs. 7.00 per head per month as washing allowance for the last two years and he is not in a position to increase the financial burden on this score. He would, rather prefer to supply two cakes of Sunlight soap in a month to each employee instead of cash allowance for the purpose.

22. Considering the price of the detergent powders and the rate of ironing of clothes etc. I consider a washing allowance of Rs. 15/- (Rupees fifteen only) per head per month as reasonable and accordingly award the same.

23. Given under my hand, this 27th day of October, 1986.

S. N. MOHANTY, Regional Labour Commissioner
(Central), Calcutta and Arbitrator.
[No. L-26015/1/86-D, III (B)]

Place : Calcutta.

Date : 27-10-1986.

नई दिल्ली 19 नवम्बर, 1986

का. अ. 4001 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार में सिंगरेनी कोलरीज कं. लिमिटेड, कोठागुडम डिवीजन, खम्माम जिला (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) के प्रबंधक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

New Delhi, the 19th November, 1986

S.O. 4001.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudam 1117 G of II/86-45.

Division, Khammam District (A.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th November, 1986.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL)
AT HYDERABAD

Industrial Dispute No. 28 of 1985

BETWEEN

The workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
Kothagudam, Khammam District, A.P.

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,
Kothagudam, Khammam District.

APPEARANCES :

Sri D.S.R. Varma, Advocate—for the Workmen.

Sarvasri K. Srinivasa Murthy, H. K. Saigal and Miss
G. Sudha, Advocates for the Management.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by its Order No. L-21011/3/85-D, III(B) dated 15-5-1985 referred the following dispute under Sections 7A and 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudam and their workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudam Division is justified in refusing to supply warm and rain coats to Valve Operators of Building Department ?

If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled ?"

The reference was registered as Industrial Dispute No. 28 of 1985 and notices were issued to both the parties.

2. The workmen filed a claims statement stating that they are working as Valve Operators in Building Department performing their jobs in open place and they are facing lot of hardship to regulate their jobs during rainy season as well as in winter season. According to him the valves are located from a long distance from water beds and from one valve to another valve there is a distance of 1 to 3 kilometers and the Valve Operators are rounding in the colonies to supply drinking water to the workers in the colonies from time to time and they are rounding near about one to four kilometers in open place having heavy rains as well as cold breezes. So they require warm coats and rain coats to the workmen working at Valve Operator in Building Department. The Valve operator are rightly entitled for warm coats and rain coats.

3. The counter filed by the management it is mentioned that time to time when wage revisions are made, N.C.W.A. is applicable to these employees and whatever wage was increased it was given to them. The wages were fixed as per the Coal Wage Board Regulations and the workmen are not entitled to claim much less benefits like rain coats and warm coats. It is respectfully submitted that there is no hazardous nature of work done by these workmen and the workmen are fully aware of nature of duties they are performing since beginning. Moreover the warm coats and rain coats are not protective equipment. There is no law or rule made by the State or Central Governments to provide warm coats and rain coats to the workmen on the ground that they are working on hazardous nature of duties subject to heavy rains and heavy cold. There was settlement arrived at on 25-1-1964 whereunder they were supplied with warm clothing. The Settlement is thus binding upon them. Thus the Petitioner-Union is especially reagitating the issue and claimed the demand to extend the facility to the Valve Operators working in Building Department which is not justifiable, it will create serious anomaly in the administration if the alleged facility is to be extended irrespective of any norms the work force being about 9,0000, soever repercussion will be there in the company.

4. The reference was made to this Tribunal on 18-5-1985 and in fact both the sides were given notices while the matter was referred to this Tribunal to appear before this Tribunal was referred to this Tribunal to appear before this Tribunal 14-8-1985 and wanted time for filing claims statement. The Management counsel vakalat on 14-11-1985. In other words while the workers counsel took time for about three months from the date of reference for filing the vakalat, the Management counsel took time for about six months to file vakalat. Then the workers counsel filed claims statement on 23-12-1985, that means, the workmen counsel had taken four months time to file claims statement after he filed vakalat. The Management filed counter on 14-2-1986 that means the management has taken another three months after six months for filing vakalat is file to file the counter. Now on 14-2-1986 onwards the matter was posted for enquiry. From 14-2-1986 it is adjourned to 18-3-1986, 24-9-1986, 4-6-1986. It is represented on 4-6-1986 that negotiations was going on between the workman and the management and they wanted time for filing the Settlement till 28-7-1986. On 28-7-1986 also the management counsel Miss G. Sudha mentioned that negotiations are still going on between the workmen and the management and requested for adjournment. Thus after more than one year, i.e. on 28-7-1986 this Tribunal after giving two adjournment for reporting settlement mentioned either they should finally report settlement or be ready for enquiry and posted the matter to 29-8-1986. Again the matter was adjourned to 29-8-1986, i.e. for about one more month and still the parties persisted time for settlement.

5. On 6-9-1986 Management counsel filed M.P. No. 307/86 stating that they filed a petition in I.D. No. 41 of 1985 on 3-9-1986 and they did not want to proceed further in the above matter as they are moving application of transfer of all their cases and as such wanted that the matter should be deferred.

7. Of course in M.P. No. 278/86 in I.D. No. 41/85 orders were passed by this Tribunal on 4-9-1986 itself stating that all or any other matters pending before me in which Miss G. Sudha representing along with Sri K. Srinivasa Murthy as Management Counsel or where both of them appear together for the Management cannot be stayed on such frivolous petition and the said petition was rejected and it is also mentioned that all the matters will be proceeded in accordance with law. This was passed in open court in the presence of the management personal officers who were present along with the Counsel Kum. D. V. Lakshmi representing Miss G. Sudha. The matter was adjourned to 4-10-1986.

7. In other words even after filing M. P. No. 307/86 on 6-9-1986 which was rejected on the same day no orders were received either transferring this matter or showing that any steps were taken by the management as alleged for transferring this matter for best reasons known to themselves. Further both parties and their Counsel called absent and there was no representation.

8. Having taken the stand that they are going to file settlement as early as on 4-10-1986 and even after four months they could not file the so called settlement in Tribunal and further the Management tried to come forward with a petition in M.P. No. 307/86 and the same was also rejected and roughly for about one month thereafter i.e. till 4-10-1986 as there was no representation from both sides and there was no settlement filed by them since it is an old matter pending for a long time and as both parties did not evidence any interest in adducing evidence or ready for arguing the matter since 14-2-1986, this Tribunal is left with no other alternative but to terminate the reference holding that the workmen are not entitled for any relief for their own latches as they did not adduce any evidence to substantiate their claims.

Reference is terminated.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 4th day of October, 1986.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

Appendix of Evidence

NIL

Dated 23-10-86.

J. VENUGOPALA RAO, Presiding Officer

[No. 1-21011/3/85-D.III(B)]

का. प्र. 4002:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मै. डाल्मिया मैग्नेसाइट कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (तमिल नाडु) के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रास के पंचाट का प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 4-11-1986 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

S.O. 4002.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation Salem (Tamil Nadu) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th November, 1986.

BEFORE THIRU FYZEE MAHMOOD, B.Sc. B.L.
PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
TAMILNADU, MADRAS

(Constituted by the Central Government)

Thursday, the 23rd day of October, 1986

Industrial Dispute No. 80 of 1983

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the Management of M/s. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem.)

BETWEEN

Thiru C. Manickam, S/o Chinna Gounder, Nagaramalai Adivaram, Near DMC Odanjalpalam, Vellakkalpatty Post, Omalur Taluk, District Salem Tamilnadu.

AND

The General Manager M/s. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation Salem Tamilnadu.

REFERENCE

Order No. L-27012(4)/83-D.III(B), dated 29-11-1983 of the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Thursday, the 11th day of September, 1986 upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiru N.G.R. Prasad for Thiruvallargal Row and Reddy and R. Rajaram, Advocates appearing for the workman and of Thiruvallargal T. S. Gopalan, P. Ibrahim Kalifulla and P. Raghunathan, Advocates appearing for the Management and this dispute having stood over till this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

This dispute between the workmen and the Management of M/s. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem arises out of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in its Order No. L. 27012(4)/83-D.III(B), dated 29-11-1983 of the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation for adjudication of the following issue

Whether the action of the management of Messrs. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem (Tamil Nadu) in dismissing Shri C. Manickam, Dumper Driver, from service with effect from 13-2-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?

(2) It is stated in the claim statement filed by the Petitioner-Workman that he was employed as a Dumper Driver in the Respondent-Corporation and he had put in nearly 13 years of service. On 9-2-1982 he was issued with a charge memo for abusing the co-worker in filthy language and assaulting him on his head with a pipe. An enquiry was conducted on the charges framed and accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer that the charges stood proved, he was dismissed from service. The Petitioner states that the domestic enquiry was not conducted in a fair and proper manner and findings of the Enquiry Officer are perverse and not supported by any legal evidence. The dismissal order passed against him is not valid. It is contended that even if the charges had been proved the punishment of dismissal is disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct committed.

(3) In the counter statement filed on behalf of the Management the allegations made in the claim statement are denied. It is stated that the Petitioner was charged for misconduct for having abused a co-worker in filthy language and assaulting him with an iron pipe amounting to acts subversive of discipline. As the explanation offered by the Petitioner was not satisfactory, a domestic enquiry was held into the charges. The Petitioner had fully participated in the enquiry and was given ample opportunity to defend himself. Accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer holding the charges as proved, a Second Show Cause Notice was issued to him on 1-4-1982 as to why he should not be dismissed from service. The Petitioner gave his representation against the proposed punishment. Having regard to the gravity of the misconduct and past record of service, the Management passed orders on 27-4-1982 dismissing the Petitioner from service. He preferred an appeal to the General Manager which was also rejected after due consideration. It is stated that the enquiry was conducted in a fair and impartial manner and that the findings of the Enquiry Officer on which the punishment of dismissal had been imposed are justified and do not call for any interference. The punishment of dismissal cannot be said to be excessive or disproportionate to the misconduct proved against the Petitioner hence the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

(4) The point for consideration as made in the reference is:

Whether the action of the management of Messrs. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation Salem, (Tamil Nadu) in dismissing Shri C. Manickam, Dumper Driver, from service with effect from 13-2-1982, is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?

(5) The Petitioner was examined as W.W.1 and Exs. W-1 to W-4 were relied upon. On behalf of the Management Thiru P. Ramasamy, Personnel Officer of the Management-Corporation was examined as M.W.1 and Exs. M-1 to M-36 were marked in support of their case.

(6) As the outset, it may be pointed out that the learned counsel for the Petitioner did not seriously challenge the validity of the domestic enquiry conducted against the Petitioner on the ground of contravention of Standing Orders or violation of principles of natural justice. On the other hand, an endorsement was made that the arguments are

confined only to the scope of section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is now well settled that under Section 11-A, the Tribunal is at liberty to consider not only whether the finding of the misconduct recorded by the employer is correct but also to satisfy itself one way or other regarding misconduct, the punishment and the relief to be granted to the concerned workman on the basis of the materials on record and on reappraisal of the evidence.

(7) The Petitioner was working as a Dumper Driver in the Respondent-Corporation and he had put in nearly 13 years of service. On 9-2-1982, he was issued with the charge memo which had been marked as Ex. M-1. The charges issued were to the following effect:

"1. That on 4-2-1982, at about 2.00 P.M. when Sri Singaraj was coming for duty, you picked up a quarrel with Sri Singaraj near A. West thinking that Sri Singaraj had dumped soil on the edge of road which is company's premises. Further you abused Sri Singaraj in filthy language when he was inside the section during working hours on the same issue.

2. Sequel to the incident mentioned above that on 5-2-82 at about 11:20 P.M. while Sri Singaraj after completing his duty was proceeding alone pushing his cycle on the road near factory as the cycle tyre had been punctured, you hit him on his head with a pipe and inflicted injury on left side of the forehead of Sri Singaraj and subsequently he was admitted in the Govt. Hospital, Salem for further treatment."

The Petitioner gave an explanation dated 14-2-1982 marked as Ex. M-2 denying the charges and as this was not accepted, an enquiry was conducted against him in respect of the allegations levelled. Exs. M-5 and M-6 are copies of the enquiry proceedings and report respectively. Accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer, holding both the charges as proved, a Second Show Cause Notice Ex. M-10 dated 1-4-1982 was issued to the Petitioner as to why he should not be dismissed from service, to which, he had given a representation marked as Ex. M-11. Thereafter the order of dismissal Ex. M-15 was passed on 27-4-1982. An appeal filed by the workman was also rejected as disclosed by Ex. M-19.

(8) The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the evidence adduced in the enquiry does not establish the charges framed against the delinquent-workman and that the finding rendered by the Enquiry Officer is perverse and not supported by the evidence on record. The first charge relates to an incident involving the Petitioner and one Thiru Singaraj who was working as a Dumper Driver. It is stated that about 2.00 P.M. on 4-2-1982 when Thiru Singaraj was reporting for duty the delinquent-workman picked up a quarrel with him for dumping soil on the road leading to his residence. It is alleged that the Petitioner had abused Thiru Singaraj in a filthy and indecent language. Dealing with this charge, it is virtually an admitted fact that the quarrel had taken place between the Petitioner and Thiru Singaraj regarding dumping of soil on the road. The Petitioner in his final statement before the Enquiry Officer had categorically narrated about this incident and stated that when he questioned Thiru Singaraj about dumping of soil on the road, he had abused him in indecent language. In other words, the fact of the incident which took place on 4-2-1982 between the Petitioner and Thiru Singaraj is virtually admitted and would appear from the material on record that both these persons had indulged in heated arguments and exchanged abusive words. Thiru K. Palanisamy, Junior Engineer who was examined as M.W.3 in the enquiry had testified that Thiru Singaraj and the delinquent had approached him after this incident and he had advised them not to quarrel over the issue of dumping soil within the Company's premises. Thiru Singaraj who was examined as M.W. 1 in the domestic enquiry had put the entire blame for the incident on the Petitioner which cannot be fully accepted in the light of the evidence on record. It is no doubt true that the Petitioner who had initiated the quarrel which appears to have led to a heated exchange between the Petitioner and Thiru Singaraj. It is also in evidence that Thiru Singaraj had in the course of this quarrel flourished

his chappals at the Petitioner. This act of Thiru Singaraj is really reprehensible and had been watered down by the Enquiry Officer on the pretext that it was only on provocation that he had shown the chappals. Whatever it may be the fact remains that Thiru Singaraj was also an active participant in the quarrel and had not only exchanged words but also made the indecent gesture of flourishing his chappals at the Petitioner. In the circumstances, on the consideration of the evidence on record, I am of the opinion that the Petitioner should be absolved on the first charge. Even if it is treated as proved it would not be a ground for inflicting the punishment of dismissal.

(9) As regards the second charge, it is actually a sequel to the earlier incident on 4-2-1982 which was the subject matter of the first charge adverted to above. Thiru Singaraj (examined as M.W. 1 in the domestic enquiry) had deposed that about 11.20 p.m. on 5-2-82 while he was returning from duty pushing his cycle, the Petitioner had waylaid him and inflicted an injury on his head with an iron pipe and when he tried to proceed towards the factory pushed him remarking as follows :

He said in the Tamil as "why are you going towards Company, go home". Therefore, the delinquent had left the scene on his cycle. M. W. 1 with the bleeding injury proceeded to the factory and informed the Time-keeper Thiru A. V. Natarajan (examined as M.W. 2 in the domestic enquiry) about what had transpired. He was given first aid and later admitted in the Government Hospital, Salem for further treatment. Thiru A. Sampat Kumar, Sergeant in the Respondent-Company (examined as M.W. 5 in the domestic enquiry) had also deposed about Thiru Singaraj being brought to him with bleeding injury and blood-stained clothes and informing him about the assault by the Petitioner. This is also corroborated by the version of Thiru A. Kalyanasundaram, Compounder (examined as M.W. 7 in the domestic enquiry) who had first attended on the injured Thiru Singaraj and sent him to the Government Hospital for further treatment. The Petitioner had examined five witnesses in the domestic enquiry whose testimonies were rightly rejected by the Enquiry Officer as unconvincing. The Enquiry Officer had given a finding that the oral evidence of M.Ws. 2, 4, 5 and 7 are cogent and convincing and clearly establish the charge levelled against the delinquent-workman. On a perusal of the documentary and oral evidence on record I do not find any reason to differ from the findings of the Enquiry Officer on this issue which are justified and proper.

(10) The only other question that remains to be considered is whether the charge held to be proved should entail the extreme penalty of dismissal from service. In the second show cause notice issued to the Petitioner marked as Ex. M-10 after the conclusion of the enquiry, it was stated that the misconduct committed by him was grave and considering his past record of previous misconducts which were detailed in the second show cause notice it was proposed to dismiss him from service. After receiving the representation of the delinquent-workman, the order of dismissal Ex. M-15 was passed on 27-4-1982. The punishing authority in paragraphs (2) and (3) of its order had stated as follows :

In the Enquiry the evidence has been examined in detail and the charges have been established. The charges proved against you are grave and serious, particularly picking up quarrel with co-worker in the working area, abusing the co-worker and inflicting head injury on a co-worker at about mid night. In the past you have been warned/suspended for various misconducts and dismissed for gheraoing company officials, but you were reinstated in view of your assurance of good conduct before Appellate Authority. It is found that the same has not been kept up.

Since there is no extenuating circumstances for a lightened punishment and it is not expedient to keep you in service any longer, you are dismissed from services of the Corporation with effect from the date of suspension i.e. 13-2-1982.

In considering the gravity of the misconduct committed by the concerned workman, in having assaulted the co-worker with a pipe resulting in a bleeding injury on his head, it cannot be gainsaid that an act of the Petitioner-workman deserves to be deprecated and is disruptive of discipline. However, it has to be noted that the relationship of the Petitioner with the injured Thiru Singaraj was quite cordial and the delinquent had looked upon M.W. 1 as his 'Guru'. This has been referred to by the Enquiry Officer himself in paragraph 44 of his findings. Admittedly, there was no personal feud between them and the incident in question relating to the assault on 5-2-1982 was only a sequel to the incident on the prior day when there was a wordy exchange between the Petitioner and Thiru Singaraj and Thiru Singaraj had showed his chappals at him. Probably the delinquent-workman was sufficiently aggrieved by the act of Thiru Singaraj for having flourished chappals at him on the previous day and this prolonged provocation might have led to his act of indiscretion in having assaulted Thiru Singaraj on the next day with a pipe. It is also on record that subsequently, a compromise was sought to be effected between the two workmen and Thiru Singaraj had rejected the offer of compensation made on behalf of the Petitioner. It would indicate that the Petitioner had regretted for his conduct in having assaulted a co-workman. Regarding the past record of service of the Petitioner which had been marked as Exs. M-22 to M-33, it is pertinent to note that all the prior punishment were trivial in nature excepting one. This related to a gherao which had taken place on 26-9-1979 in which the Petitioner had also taken part. In respect of the above incident he was dismissed from service and had subsequently been reinstated without back wages. Apart from the incident relating to gherao in which number of workmen had taken part there was no other grave charge levelled against him in the past relating to serious indiscipline or intimidating or assaulting any co-employee.

(11) It is no doubt true that on the above charge established against the Petitioner he would be guilty of misconduct under cause 57(27) of the Standing Orders marked as Ex. M-36 which could be a ground for dismissal. However, taking into account the fact that the Petitioner had put in nearly 13 years of service and earning member of his family and the other attendant circumstances adverted to above which had led to the incident of assault complained of, in my view, the punishment of dismissal imposed would be harsh and excessive and disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct committed. Accordingly holding charge No. 2 as proved, the order of dismissal passed is set aside and the Petitioner is directed to be reinstated in service before 1-1-1987 without back wages but with continuity of service. If the Petitioner is not reinstated as directed he would be entitled to claim full wages and other attendant benefits from 1-1-1987 till the date of reinstatement. An award is passed accordingly. No costs.

Dated, this 23rd day of October, 1986.

Sd/- (Illegible), Industrial Tribunal

WITNESSES EXAMINED

For workmen :

W.W.1—Thiru C. Manickam.

For Management :

M.W.1—Thiru P. Ramasamy.

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For workmen

Ex. W-1/21-9-82—Typed copy of letter from W.W. 1 to the Management for reinstatement.

Ex. W-2/5-10-82—Typed copy of 2(A) Petition filed by W.W.1 before the Central Labour Commissioner.

Ex. W-3/25-2-83—Typed copy of minutes of the Conciliation Proceedings.

Ex. W-4/14-3-83—Typed copy of conciliation failure report of the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) II, Madras.

For Maangement

- Ex. M-1/9-2-82—Copy of charge sheet to W.W.1 (C. Manickam).
- Ex. M-2/14-2-82—Explanation given by W.W.1 to Ex. M-1.
- Ex. M-3—Attendance Card.
- Ex. M-4/19-2-82—Enquiry notice.
- Ex. M-5—Enquiry Proceedings.
- Ex. M-6—Enquiry Report.
- Ex. M-7/1-3-82—Letter from the Magnesite National Labour Union to the Management.
- Ex. M-8—O. P. Hospital card of Singaraj.
- Ex. M-9/3-3-82—Wound certificate issued to Singaraj Government Head Quarters Hospital, Salem.
- Ex. M-10/1-4-82—Copy of Second Show Cause Notice to W.W.1.
- Ex. M-11/4-4-82—Letter from W.W.1 to the Assistant Manager of Management.
- Ex. M-12/9-4-82—Copy of letter from the Management to W.W.1.
- Ex. M-13/12-4-82—Copy of letter from the Management to W.W.1.
- Ex. M-14/18-4-82—Letter from WW-1 (C. Manickam) to the Management regarding reply to Show-Cause Notice.
- Ex. M-15/27-4-82—Copy of dismissal order issued to WW-1.
- Ex. M-16/7-5-82—Appeal preferred by C. Manickam (W.W.1) to the General Manager, Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem.
- Ex. M-17/12-5-82—Copy of reply from the Appellate Authority to W.W.1 directing to appear for hearing.
- Ex. M-18/21-5-82—Proceedings of the Appellate Authority.
- Ex. M-19/26-5-82—Order copy of the Appellate Authority confirming the dismissal of W.W.1.
- Ex. M-20/21-9-82—Letter from W.W.1 to the General Manager requesting for reinstatement after the order passed in Appeal.
- Ex. M-21/29-9-82—Reply by the Management to Ex. M-20.
- Ex. M-22/17-7-75—Charge sheet to W.W.1 for previous misconduct.
- Ex. M-23/28-4-75—Suspension order copy to W.W.1.
- Ex. M-24/16-9-75—Copy of charge sheet to W.W.1 for previous misconduct.
- Ex. M-25/5-12-75—Copy of suspension order to W.W.1.
- Ex. M-26/18-10-76—Copy of warning notice to W.W.1 for unauthorised absence.
- Ex. M-27/11-10-76—Copy of charge sheet to W.W.1 for the incident on 8-10-76.
- Ex. M-28/16-3-77—Warning notice to W.W.1.
- Ex. M-29/18-7-79—Warning issued to W.W.1 for unauthorised absence.
- Ex. M-30/27-9-79—Copy of charge sheet to W.W.1 for the incident took place on 26-9-79.

- Ex. M-31/9-2-80—Copy of dismissal order issued to W.W.1.
- Ex. M-32/22-8-80—Enquiry proceedings conducted by the Appellate Authority.
- Ex. M-33/11-9-80—Copy of Office Order reinstating W.W.1 as Mazdoor with continuity of service but without back wages.
- Ex. M-34/10-9-80—Copy of letter from the President of Magnesite National Labour Union to the Appellate Authority.
- Ex. M-35/23-6-80—Delegation of powers to the Assistant Manager, Salem Works issued by the Director.
- Ex. M-36—True copy of Standing Orders of the Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem.

FYZEEMEHMOOD, Presiding Officer

[No. L-27012/4/83-D.III(B)]

V. K. SHARMA, Desk Officer

मई दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 1986

का. आ. 4003.—मैसर्स-डी कालूपुर कामशियल को-ऑपरेटिव्स लि., थोखा बाजार, कालूपुर, ग्रहमदाबाव (जी.जे/ 4682) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी किसी पृथक अभिदाय या प्रीमियम का संदाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की जीवन बीमा स्कीम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा के रूप में जो फायदा उठा रहे हैं वे ऐसे कर्मचारियों को उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हैं जो उन्हें कर्मचारी निक्षेप सहबद्ध बीमा स्कीम, 1976 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन अनुभोग्य हैं ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 4572 तारीख 22-11-1983 के अनुसरण में और इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त स्थापन को, 17-12-1986 से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए जिसमें 16-12-1989 भी सम्मिलित है, उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजन प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, गुजरात को ऐसी विवरणियां भेजना और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधायें प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करे।

2. नियोजक ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रभागों का प्रत्येक मास की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर संदाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय

सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3क) के खंड (क) के अधीन समय समय पर निर्दिष्ट करे।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रशासन में, जिसके अंतर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रीमियम का संदाय लेखाओं का अंतरण, निरीक्षण प्रभारों का संदाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या की भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद स्थापन के सूचना पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है तो नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसकी बाबत आवश्यक प्रीमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को सन्दत्त करेगा।

6. यदि सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाये जाते हैं तो, नियोजक उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि की जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा जिससे कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हों, जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुमेय हैं।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी की मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन संदेय रकम उस रकम से कम है जो कर्मचारी को उस दशा में संदेय होती जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिक वारिस/नामनिर्देशिती को प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अंतर के बराबर रकम का संदाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक स्कीम के उपबंधों में कोई भी संशोधन, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त गुजरात के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जाएगा और जहां किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना हो, वहां प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का व्यक्तिगत अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की इस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है, अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम द्वारा नियत तारीख के भीतर प्रीमियम का संदाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्ययगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के संदाय में किए गए किसी व्यतिक्रम की दशा में, उन मृत सदस्यों के नामनिर्देशितियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अंतर्गत होते, बीमा फायदों के संदाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य की मृत्यु होने पर भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम, बीमाकृत राशि के हकदार नामनिर्देशिती/विधिक वारिसों को उस राशि का संदाय तत्परता से और प्रत्येक दशा में हर प्रकार से पूर्ण दावे की प्राप्ति के एक मास के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[संख्या एस-35019-224/83-पी. एफ-2/एस.एस-2]

New Delhi, the 18th November, 1986

S.O. 4003.—Whereas Messrs The Kalupur Commercial Co-operative Bank Limited, Chokha Bazar, Kalupur, Ahmedabad (GJ/4682) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of Section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act).

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution of payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees Deposit Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of Section 17 of the said Act and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, S.O. 4572 dated the 22nd November, 1983 and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a further period of three years with effect from 17th December, 1986 upto and inclusive of the 16th December, 1989.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Gujarat and maintain such accounts and provide such facilities for inspection as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of Section 17 of the said Act within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the Notice Board of the establishments, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government, and as and

when amended, alongwith a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said Scheme are enhanced so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding any thing contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme, shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Gujarat and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the said establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium etc. within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the members covered under the Scheme the Life Insurance Corporation of India shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs of the deceased member entitled for it and in any case within one month from the receipt of claim complete in all respects.

[No. S. 35014/224/83-PF. II-SS. II]

का. आ. 4004.—मैसर्स-इन्टरनेशनल कम्प्यूटर्स इन्डियन मैन्फैक्चर लिमिटेड फाजल ओ ए बिल्डिंग, एम. जी. रोड, बम्बई-1 (एम. एच./3980) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी किसी पृथक् अभिदाय या प्रीमियम का सन्दाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की जीवन बीमा स्कीम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा

के रूप में जो फायदा उठा रहे हैं वे ऐसे कर्मचारियों को उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल है जो उन्हें कर्मचारी निक्षेपसहबद्ध बीमा स्कीम, 1976 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन अनुज्ञेय हैं;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 क उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 4645 तारीख 22-11-1983 के अनुसरण में और इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त स्थापन को, 24-12-1986 से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए जिसमें 23-12-1989 भी सम्मिलित है, उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में नियोजन प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त महाराष्ट्र को ऐसी विवरणियां भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधाएं प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रभारों का प्रत्येक मास की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर सन्दाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (3क) के खण्ड (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रशासन में, जिसके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना, विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रीमियम का सन्दाय लेखाओं का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण प्रभारों का सन्दाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या की भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद, स्थापन के सूचना-पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है तो नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरंत दर्ज करेगा और उसकी बाबत आवश्यक प्रीमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को सन्दाय करेगा।

6. यदि सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाये जाते हैं तो, नियोजक उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि की जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा जिससे कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हों, जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुज्ञेय हैं।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी की मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन सं देय रकम उस रकम से कम है जो कर्मचारी को उस दशा में सन्देश होती जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिक वारिस/नाम निर्देशिनी को प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अंतर के बराबर रकम का सन्दाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक स्कीम के उपबन्धों में कोई भी संशोधन, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जाएगा और जहाँ किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना हो वहाँ, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का यक्तियुक्त अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की उस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है, अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम द्वारा नियत तारीख के भीतर प्रीमियम का सन्दाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्ययगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के सन्दाय में किए गए किसी व्यतिक्रम की दशा में, उन मृत सदस्यों के नाम-निर्देशितियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह, छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होते, बीमा फायदों के सन्दाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य की मृत्यु होने पर भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम, बीमाकृत राशि के हकदार नामनिर्देशित/विधिक वारिसों को उस राशि का सन्दाय तत्परता से और प्रत्येक दशा में हर प्रकार से पूर्ण दावे की प्राप्ति के एक मास के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[संख्या एस.-35014/226/83-पी. एफ.-2/एस. एस. 2]

S.O. 4004.—Whereas Messrs International Computers Indian Manufacture Limited, Fazalbhoy Building, M.G. Road, Bombay-1 (MH/3980) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of Section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act).

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution of payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees Deposit Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of Section 17 of the said Act and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, S.O. 4645 dated the 22nd November, 1983 and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a further period of three years with effect from 24th December, 1986 upto and inclusive of the 23rd December, 1989.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Maharashtra and maintain such accounts and provide such facilities for inspection as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of Section 17 of the said Act within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc., shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the notice board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended, alongwith a translation of the salient features incept, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said Scheme are enhanced so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding any thing contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer, shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme, shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Maharashtra and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the said establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium etc. within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the members covered under the Scheme the Life Insurance Corporation of India shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs of the deceased member entitled for it and in any case within one month from the receipt of claim complete in all respects.

[No. S-35014/226/83-PF-II-SS-II]

का.आ. 4005.—मैसर्स पॉलीचम लि., अमरोदज टाटा रोड, बम्बई-20 (एम.एच/9116) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकरण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी किसी पृथक अभिधाय या प्रमियम का सन्दाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम का जीवन बीमा स्कीम को सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा के रूप में जो फायदा उठा रहे हैं वे ऐसे कर्मचारियों को उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल है जो उन्हें कर्मचारी निरोप सहबद्ध बीमा स्कीम, 1976 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन अनुज्ञेय है;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 4721 तारीख 24-11-1983 के अनुसरण में और इससे उपबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त स्थापन को, 24-12-1986 से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए जिसमें 23-12-1989 भी सम्मिलित है, उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देता है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में नियोजन प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त महाराष्ट्र को ऐसा विवरणियां भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसा सुविधाएं प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करे।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रभारों का प्रत्येक मास की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर सन्दाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3क) के खण्ड (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करे।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रशासन में, जिसके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना, विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रमियम का सन्दाय लेखाओं का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण प्रभारों का सन्दाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का बहुत नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब

कम, उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों को बहुसंख्या का भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद, स्थापन के सूचना-पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन को भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है तो नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसका बाबत आवश्यक प्रमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को सन्दाय करेगा।

6. यदि सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाये जाते हैं तो, नियोजक उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि को जाने का व्यवस्था करेगा जिस से कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हों, जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुज्ञेय हैं।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी को मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन सन्देश्य रकम उस रकम से कम है जो कर्मचारी को उस वृत्ति में सन्देश्य होता जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारियों के विधिक वारिस/नामनिर्देशितों को प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अन्तर के बराबर रकम का सन्दाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक स्कीम के उपबन्धों में कोई भी संशोधन, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जाएगा और जहां किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना हो वहां, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का व्यक्तिगत अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को उस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है, अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकता है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम द्वारा नियत तारीख के भीतर प्रमियम का सन्दाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्ययगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रमियम के सन्दाय में किए गए किसी व्यतिक्रम का वृत्ति में, उन मृत सदस्यों के नाम-निर्देशितियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह, छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होते, बीमा फायदों के सन्दाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. इस स्कीम के अधिन आने वाले किसी सदस्य का मृत्यु होने पर भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम, ब.मा.कृत राशि के हकदार नामनिर्देशित/विधिक वारिस का उस राशि का सम्बन्ध तत्पश्चात् से आर प्रत्येक दशा में हर प्रकार से पूर्ण दावे का प्राप्त के एक मास के अन्तर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[स. एस-35014(245)/83-पी.एफ.-2/एस.एस.-2]

S.O. 4005.—Whereas Messrs Polychem Limited, 7, Jamshedji Tata Road, Bombay-20 (Miri/9110) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of Section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act).

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution of payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees Deposit Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of Section 17 of the said Act and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, S.O. 4721 dated the 24th November, 1983 and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a further period of three years with effect from 24th December, 1986 upto and inclusive of the 23rd December, 1989.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Maharashtra and maintain such accounts and provide facilities for inspection as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of Section 17 of the said Act within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the Notice Board of the establishments, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended, along with a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available in the employees under the said Scheme are enhanced so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme, shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Maharashtra and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the said establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium etc. Within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, of any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the members covered under the Scheme the Life Insurance Corporation of India shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs of the deceased member entitled for it and in any case within one month from the receipt of claim complete in all respects.

[No. S. 35014/245/83-PF. II-SS. II]

का. आ. 4006:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 के पैरा 4 के उप-पैरा (1) के अनुसरण में, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii), तारीख 31 दिसम्बर, 1983 में प्रकाशित, भारत के श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 4784, तारीख 12 दिसम्बर, 1983 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, "सदस्य" शीर्षक के नीचे क्रम संशर्पक 9 के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

"श्री ईश्वर चन्द्र सूद,

महा सचिव,

इण्डियन नेशनल ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस

द्वारा : श्री बालकृष्णन्,

शापकीपर,

डाकघर—देहरादोपीपुर,

कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

[संख्या बी-20012/17/78-पी.एफ.-2]

टिप्पणी:—मूल अधिसूचना, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3 (ii) में का. आ. 4784 द्वारा प्रकाशित हुई थी और तत्पश्चात् निम्नलिखित द्वारा संशोधित की गई:—

क्रम सं.	राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख
1. 3024	22-9-1984
2. 2857	22-6-1985

S.O. 4006.—In pursuance of sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 4 of the Employees, Provident Fund Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Dett. of Labour) No. S.O. 4784, dated the 12th December, 1983 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 31st December, 1983 namely :—

In the said notification under the heading 'Members' against serial No 7 for the entry, the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

"Shri Ishwar Chandra Sood, General Secretary, Indian National Trade Union Congress C/O Shri Balkrishan, Shopkeeper, Post Office Dehragopipur Kangra, Himachal Pradesh".

[V-20012/2/17/78-PF, II]

Note.—The principal notification was published with S.O. 4784 in the Gazette of India Part-II, Section 3(ii) and was subsequently amended by the following notifications :—

S.O.	date
1. 3024	22-9-1984
2. 2858	26-6-1985

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1986

का. भा. 4007 :—केंद्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91-क के साथ पठित धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स भारत इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स लिमिटेड, लायसन सेल सी. पी. डी., आगरा को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से 1 अगस्त, 1985 से 31 जुलाई, 1986 तक की अवधि के लिए जिसमें यह तारीख भी सम्मिलित है, छूट देती है।

2. उक्त छूट निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रवृत्त था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) ऐसी विवरणियाँ ऐसे प्ररूप में और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी थी;
- (2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक या इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत निगम का कोई अन्य पदधारी,—

- (i) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त अवधि के लिए दी गई किसी विवरणी की विशिष्टियों को सत्यापित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए; या
- (ii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेख उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गए थे या नहीं; या

(iii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दी गई उन प्रसुविधाओं को, जो ऐसी प्रसुविधाएं हैं जिनके प्रतिफलस्वरूप इस अधिमूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद और वस्तु-रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है, या नहीं; या

(iv) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कि उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबन्धों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं;

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिए सशक्त होगा :—

- (क) प्रधान नियोजक या अव्यवहित नियोजक से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जो वह आवश्यक समझे; या
- (ख) ऐसे प्रधान नियोजक या अव्यवहित नियोजक के अधिभोग में के कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके भारसाधक व्यक्ति से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के सन्वाय से संबंधित ऐसे लेखावहियाँ और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करने दे या वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जो वह आवश्यक समझे; या
- (ग) प्रधान नियोजक या अव्यवहित नियोजक की, उसके अधिकर्ता या सेवक की या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि वह कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना; या
- (घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखावही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना।

[संख्या एस-38014/4/86-एस.एस. 1]

स्पष्टीकारक ज्ञापन

इस मामले में छूट को भूतलक्षी प्रभाव देना आवश्यक हो गया है क्योंकि छूट के आवेदन पर कार्यवाही करने में समय लगा था। किन्तु यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि छूट को भूतलक्षी प्रभाव देने से किसी भी व्यक्ति के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1986

S.O. 4007.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 read with section 91-A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby exempts M/s. Bharat Electronics Ltd., Liaison Cell,

OD, Agra, from the operation of the said Act for a period of one year with effect from 1st August, 1985, upto and inclusive of the 31st July, 1986.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 ;
- (2) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of :—
 - (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 for the said period ; or
 - (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period ; or
 - (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration which exemption is being granted under this notification ; or
 - (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the said Act has been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory ;

be empowered to :—

- (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or
- (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found incharge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or
- (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee ; or
- (d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

[F. No. S-38014/4/86-SS-I]

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case as the processing of the application for exemption took time. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of any body adversely.

का. आ. 4008 :—भारत हेवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लिमिटेड ने (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) उपदान संदाय अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 39) की (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) धारा 5 के अधीन छूट के लिए आवेदन किया है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि उपदान फायदों की बाबत भारत हेवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लिमिटेड, कर्मचारी उपदान निधि नियमों के अधीन जैसे कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारियों को लागू हैं, संवेद्य उपदान फायदे उक्त कर्मचारियों के लिए उन फायदों से कम अनुकूल नहीं है जो उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन प्रदत्त किए गए हैं ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त स्थापन को, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रारम्भ होने वाली तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए, निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) यदि भारत हेवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लिमिटेड, कर्मचारी उपदान निधि नियमों के कार्यान्वयन की बाबत कोई विवाद उत्पन्न होता है तो उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन नियंत्रक प्राधिकारी और अपील प्राधिकारी को मध्यस्थता करने और उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्धों के अनुसार उसका अवधारण करने की शक्ति होगी, और
- (2) भारत हेवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लिमिटेड उपदान निधि नियमों में केन्द्रीय सरकार की लिखित पूर्व अनुज्ञा के बिना कोई परिवर्तन नहीं किया जाएगा ।

[सं. एस. 70014/1/84-एफ पी जी/एडएस-II]

ए. के. भट्टारai, मवर सचिव

S.O. 4008.—Whereas the Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) has applied for exemption under section 5 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 (39 of 1972) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas in the opinion of the Central Government, the gratuity benefits payable under the Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited, Employees' Gratuity Fund Rules as applicable to the employees of the said establishment with respect to gratuity benefits are not less favourable to the said employees than those conferred under the said Act ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of the provisions of the said Act, for a period of three years commencing from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (1) If any dispute arises with regard to the implementation of the Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited Employees' Gratuity Fund Rules, the Controlling Authority and Appellate Authority under the said Act shall have the power to intervene and determine it in accordance with the provisions of the said Act ; and
- (2) No change in the Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited Employees' Gratuity Fund Rules shall be made without prior permission in writing of the Central Government.

[No. S-70014/1/84-FPG (SS-II)]

A. K. BHATTARAI, Under Secy.